

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VII

MAY, 1907

NO. 11

Socialism in France and Italy.*

An Address delivered before the Society of Ethical Culture of Chicago,
in Steinway Hall, Sunday morning, Jan. 20, 1907.

We are under the impression in this country that we are the most advanced and progressive country in the world. In comparison we think of the old world as backward and stagnant. But I was convinced a few years ago when in England, that that country had some things to teach us, that in certain respects she was politically and socially in advance of us. I admit that there is no place to make money in like America — and probably no place like it to get an education in; perhaps on these accounts we can explain the vast emigration to our shores from the old world — men have better chances of earning a living here, and their children have better chances to be educated. But at least as respect to education, parts of Europe are fast overtaking us, Germany and France particularly; everywhere the waters are stirring, even in Russia, and new currents of change are setting in, even if only to reach results already attained in this country; and in some respects we see Europe at a stage of evolution actually beyond us.

I have found it refreshing to consider and present to you two phases of European progress in recent addresses. The most Catholic country in Europe has become practically un-Catholic and is revising her political arrangements accordingly; treating

* This article is written by a non-socialist, but largely because of that fact presents phases of socialism that would be overlooked by a Socialist. The critical reader will note some minor errors, the most important being the statement that the French Socialist are still acting with the Left Bloc. (Ed.)

the old church justly, even liberally and yet no longer forcing all citizens to support it. Another country, the most despotically governed in Europe, is rising or preparing to rise to throw off this despotism.* The one is an episode in the breaking up of the old faith and the movement for religious freedom; the other is an episode in the struggle for political liberty. Though what they aim at we already have attained in this country, it is inspiring to witness the struggle — for the spirit of progress is the vital thing, rather than the special steps that are taken.

Today I wish to bring before you an episode of progress of another kind. It is in the social or economic realm. It has to do with a part of the population that has not been much considered in the past. I mean those who do the manual labor of the world. It is said, sometimes reproachfully, that Socialism is a class movement. Undoubtedly, that is just its significance — and after all, there is no reproach in its being so. In the higher movements of the worlds, in religion, in science, there may be no classes, but politics and economics are distinctly a lower sphere, and in them, at least till mankind are altogether regenerated, there are bound to be classes. We have manufacturers' associations and commercial clubs and count it only natural that industrial leaders and merchants should organize to protect and advance their interests. There is no reason why it should not be counted equally natural for working people to organize to protect and advance their interests.

Now Socialism is the view underlying the workingman's organization or party, *par excellence*. It is an extreme assertion of their rights and claims. From its point of view, the working-class are the only class worth considering in the State; they produce everything; they should control everything, they should have everything; the employing class, the capitalist class, the landlord class are parasitic, unnecessary and, in the future society, will pass away; the laboring class will be all in all; everyone will have to labor or else cease to have the means to live. It is an extreme proposition, and yet extravagant assertions are sometimes a sign of life. The vanity and overweening self-consciousness of the young often betoken real power, and the overstatements of socialist working people are a more hopeful sign than the understatements, the meek and lowly statements, which laborers have made, or been sedulously taught to make, in the past. If we want the workingman to rise in the world, to become

* See "The Conflict of the Catholic church with the French Republic," *Ethical Addresses* (Philadelphia) April, 1907; and "The Russian Revolution," *International Journal of Ethics*, April, 1907.

a real sharer in the civilized life of society (as I urged in a lecture not long ago), we must not wonder at Socialism or be too much shocked by it, or do anything but expect it and even be encouraged by it—since at bottom it is but the exuberant expression of a new, vigorous life rising in the world, and discussion and reflection and experience will abate its excesses in time.

It is interesting to note that there is more socialism in the old world than here. This is partly because America has been the land of opportunity and a definitely marked working-class is only beginning to arise among us. Workingmen have often become small employers or even big employers in time; they have saved and become capitalists, sometimes landlords. When there is free passage from one class to another, classes hardly exist. Every boy may become President, so he may become a Rockefeller, a Marshall Field. In a fluid condition of society there is no chance for Socialism, no occasion for it. But plainly this is all because America is very young, and as fast as the resources of the country become appropriated and industry and trade organized, the chances for a workingman to pass from his class into the others become less. In old Europe there have never been the chances there are here, and we are gradually becoming more and more like Europe. There has always been a more or less definitely marked working-class there, and there is beginning to be one here. Hence it is only natural that there should be more Socialism in the old world than here, Socialism being preeminently the organization or party of the working-class.

But the point which I wish to bring out today, the episodes on which I wish to dwell, are to the effect that Socialism over there is getting into touch with actuality, is taking on some kind of workable shape, is learning moderation and wisdom, and promises to hammer itself out into an actually useful instrument for the reform of society. What I have particularly in mind is the attitude of a socialist leader like Jaurès, as shown in a great debate between him and Clemenceau in the French Chamber last June, and also the leadership of Ferri among the Italian socialists, as demonstrated in a stormy congress held in October in Rome. Still better proof would be furnished by the Independent Labor Party and the dominance of Kerr Hardie in it in the English Parliament and by the leadership of men of the type of Liebknecht and Bebel among the socialists of Germany; but as it happens, I was in southern Europe last year, and it is what happened there that particularly impressed me.

Socialism in France and Italy as elsewhere in Europe has been a thing of sentiment, of vague ideas, of criticism and protest,

and occasionally of violence down to recent years. It has been a kind of dream, that had little to do with the actual world—an aspiration that could not help being nebulous, because there was no attempt to put into practice. Even when it became a party and a program, it either elected no one or else so few that they had no influence and the program was simply generalities, formulas, in the air. It was only some fourteen years ago (1893) that the socialists began to count in the French Chamber; and it was only a year earlier (1892) that the Italian Socialist Party was born. But with numbers and influence, and even if ever so slight, a measure of responsibility, a change has been coming. There were 46 Socialist French Deputies as the result of the elections of 1902 and 76 were returned by the elections of last Spring. They with the "Socialist Radicals" and "Radicals" make now a large majority in the Chamber of Deputies.

The Socialist Party in Italy get between a fourth and a fifth of the votes polled throughout the kingdom and have in the neighborhood of thirty (30) representatives (sometimes more and sometimes less) in the Parliament at Rome. So large is the Socialist representation in the German Reichstag that Liebknecht contemplated the possibility that the Party might be called on "to govern, or at least share in the government," and he declared himself ready, if necessary, to become a Minister of the Kaiser;* in England, John Burns is already in the Cabinet; in France, two socialists help make up the present ministry, Millerand and Briand; in Italy, a republican has already had a Cabinet position, and it is not at all impossible that a socialist might be offered one. The present king is one of the most cultivated minds and one of the most intelligent sovereigns in Europe and, it is said, would see with pleasure men like Turati and Bissolati (who represent the right wing of Italian Socialism) in power.**

Circumstances like these change the situation for Socialism. The imminency of responsibility sobers men. Vague war cries and enthusiasm for the ideal no longer suffice. The question is no longer the theory merely, but what are we going to do? What have we definitely to propose as to the laws or the conduct or the government? I found myself taking a curious interest in following a verbatim report (in an Italian translation) of Jaurès' speeches in his parliamentary duel or tournament (as some have called it) with Clemenceau last summer. It was almost as if one were on the brink of a great social change—not a cataclysm, but an orderly transformation by law—and Jaures were explaining to us as a practical man of affairs what it was and how

* So T. H. B. Browne, "National Review", Nov. 1906.

** So Raquini, "Nouvelle Revue", Nov. 15, 1906.

it was to be done. I say "almost," for it was not quite. And yet if Europe goes as it has been going for the last fifteen or twenty years, the Socialists will be actually in control of the government in Germany and France within the next quarter of a century; and perhaps in England and Italy, too; and there will be more discourses like that of Jaurès, and more than that, absolutely definite plans of what is to be done in the socialistic direction. I think you will be interested with me in noting some of the points which Jaurès made. First, a word about him personally. Jaurès, like Clemenceau, is a marked individual. He is not a workingman, but a lawyer, belonging to the middle class. He is a man of large culture, has written books on philosophy and on French history. He is singularly genial. He is spoken of a "Bonny, bluff, red-faced M. Jaurès." By common consent he seems to be ranked the first orator in the French Assembly; he has massiveness, physical and mental, imagination, warmth of sentiment, humor—in short, power; and yet it is power in control. He is a thorough socialist and yet he does not rant; indeed, the reporter of a conservative and reliable Italian paper said that his criticisms of the ministry, pricking as they did on this occasion, were made in such good temper that they gave no offense and that the throng of elegant ladies present found that this terrible Jaures, who wished to send existing society head-over-heels into the air, was the most chastened and moderate orator in the French parliament.*

The speeches of Jaurès, it should be explained, were after a declaration by the Government of its intentions or program and were a criticism of that declaration. They did not set out to state a program of his own, that Jaurès promises to do later; but in the course of his discussion the broad outlines of his program appear.

The main idea of Socialism comes out in its most sweeping form. It is the total transformation of society, in the interests of the laboring class. Only those who labor shall possess and direct. They will constitute collective society or the State, and only the collectivity will employ and produce and own the means of production, and private employers and capitalists will exist no more. This he frankly calls a revolutionary aim; but the method for attaining it, he as explicitly says, is reformatory and realistic. It is undoubtedly as to methods and plans of procedure that socialists most differ. "When we shout for ideas," said one of them in France, "it is as musical as heaven; when we discuss our practical program, it is as discordant as hell." Jaurès has his own ideas as to practical methods and is most pronounced in ut-

* "Corriere della Sera" (Milan) 15 June, 1906.

tering them, and it is at least significant that he is one of the two great leaders of French Socialism today. He is against violence and for law and change by law. He recognizes that Socialism cannot be introduced by the violent act of a minority, but only by the clear will and consent of the immense majority of the citizens, and hence it is a preliminary necessity for Socialism to win the following of the majority. Some would array the working-class against the employing class and precipitate a general strike. Jaurès deprecates a general strike, regarding it as a preliminary to a violent revolution, which would probably fail. In this speech he said, "I deplore any and every attempt to turn the working-class from legal methods." Apropos of strikes which France had been having, he declared that the success of the great strikes depends on the tranquil force of the organizations, on the cohesion of the working people, on the way in which they proceed; that acts of violence against persons or property only compromise the victory and falsify the meaning of the struggle; that the Social Revolution does not propose to maltreat individuals, but rather to assure the life and dignity of all, even of those now privileged, under the common law of sovereign labor; that it no more proposes to destroy or injure property, workshops, mines or machinery, but to transfer proprietorship in these things to the laborers, liberated and organized; that attempts against property or persons are crimes against Socialism, even more than against present society.

It is true that Jaurès speaks of "expropriation;" for capital, the means of production, are in private hands now and they are to be in the hands of the collectivity in the future, according to the socialist plan. But let us not be offended at a word. "Expropriation" need not be an illegal thing, it need not be unjust. If it is done in a time of war, anything may happen. In our Civil War, the Southern planters were expropriated of their slaves as much as if a capitalist had his stocks and bonds taken away from him today, or a land-owner his land; and there was no compensation. But if the expropriation had taken place before the War, the slave-owners would probably have been compensated, as English slave-owners were in the West Indies earlier in the century. In times of peace expropriation goes on all the time for reasons of public utility — goes on according to law and with compensation. If a railroad is built, not everybody owning land along which the line must go, sells willingly, and the State allows the road to condemn land, paying for it at a reasonable price. Expropriation is now going on among some of our neighbors at Henry Booth House* for a public park is to be made, and the land, if not willingly sold, has to be taken,

* [A Chicago Social Settlement. Ed.]

but of course, with compensation. Public utility justifies and sometimes necessitates expropriation, but in a civilized community this is always done with the least possible disadvantage to the proprietor. It is important to notice — for it does not accord with popular ideas about Socialism — that the advocates of so revolutionary a change in the general property system as Socialism implies, do not always mean by expropriation confiscation. For reasons of public utility, as they hold, the factories, the mines, the railroads, the great landed estates, must be taken over by collective society and administered not for private profit, but for the general good, but it does not follow that the present owners are to be arbitrarily despoiled. Kautsky, one of the leaders in Germany, says, "Expropriation does not signify necessarily spoliation." Marx himself has said, "If we are able to proceed by means of indemnity, the revolution will cost less dear;" and Liebknecht urged it as a duty to give those who are injured by the legal changes to be made an indemnity as high as is compatible with the public interest. Jaurès in his speech quotes these authorities and is of the same mind with them. Of course, what will happen he does not know, as no one knows. He recalls the fact that the French Revolution of 1789 began by decreeing expropriation with indemnity and the purchase of the greater part of the old feudal rights, but that when Europe and her own nobles set themselves against France and brought on war, the expropriation was made without indemnity. But all his thought and hopes and plans are for a peaceful evolution of society and a legal revolution; the weight of his personality and all his persuasiveness, whether with working people or with the other classes in society, go that way; and in accordance with it, expropriation with compensation is his program. There is only one limitation: with the indemnity which slaveholders have sometimes received, when slavery was abolished, they were not at liberty to buy slaves again, and with the indemnity which capitalists may receive for the capital or means of production taken from them, they are not to be at liberty to buy the means of production again; they will only be able to use it for living purposes, not for reinvestment.

As an observer of the times, a student of social movements, I find this interesting, yet it must be admitted that it is still very general. When Jaurès becomes more specific and says what the new socialistic society will actually do, he speaks of its carrying on great public undertakings, of its providing healthy and spacious habitations for the people and breaking up landlord tyranny, of its bringing to the peasants the means of improving their cultivation of the land and of developing the fertility of

the soil, of its insuring all of every class against the risks of life, and of its raising salaries and wages, particularly those of the little and humble; for, taking on an almost evangelical strain and paraphrasing the words of Jesus, he declared it would not be necessary that a single worker should perish. It is all admirable in conception and spirit, yet it is not absolutely different from tendencies existing in society today, and particularly when Jaurès speaks of what is to be done now, before the new society is inaugurated, his proposals are much the same as those which his opponent in the duel, Clemenceau, himself makes. He is for an income tax, a progressive one; but Clemenceau is, too. He is for an eight-hour day; but Clemenceau will do all in his power to obtain it (all, that is, without provoking a catastrophe, which would be involved in a sudden, uniform, compulsory substitution of eight hours for the eleven hours now commonly prevailing). He is for the organization of labor and collective bargaining as to wages; but Clemenceau is for the same things, save that when there are those who do not wish to enter the organizations, he would respect and protect their liberty. Jaurès wants the railroads and mines nationalized; but Clemenceau is against private monopolies too, and differs only (if he differs at all) in that he would take them up one by one and be guided more or less by circumstances as to when and how; he was ready, he declared, to begin proceedings for the purchase of certain railways now. Indeed, Clemenceau said in so many words to Jaurès, "Your practical program is ours," and Jaurès afterwards agreed as to the truth of the statement.

After England, French politics are in this way the most interesting in Europe at the present time; for since the debate I am describing, Clemenceau has become the head of the ministry, and, in the broad outlines of his policy, is backed by a large majority in the Chamber of Deputies — a majority in which Radicals, Socialist Radicals and Socialists form one "bloc" (as it is called), against the Royalists, conservatives and reactionaries generally. The whole level of Parliamentary ideas and action is lifted, so that, after England at least, France leads Europe; though the movement is the same in kind as is rising in our country and has as its spokesmen Roosevelt and Bryan, who after all do not so widely differ. But the conclusion of this part of my discussion, which I particularly wished to draw is that Socialism, when it ceases to be a thing of the closet, mingles with men, enters politics and is bent on accomplishing something, tends to abate its extravagance and fanaticism and becomes simply another fresh force for leading the world onward and upward. The happiest thing for Socialism (and for the world)

would be to actually acquire governmental power somewhere, for then it would grow more practical yet, would slough off still more some of its unworkable ideas, would discover simply by facing the situation and actual experience that labor and the laboring man were not everything in the State, that society needed men capable of taking the lead and willing to run risks in industry and that it needed men ready to save and re-invest, that the real question was not of one class rising to supreme power, but of an adjustment of classes, all contributing in various ways and by various services to the good and harmony of the commonwealth. The only class that I can see is really superfluous in society is the landlord class; not those who build houses and improve land, but those who receive ground rent; they do not need to do anything for society, but they can take all the same.

But now let me turn to Italy. The Socialist Party is not nearly as far along in the path of development here as in France. It is not in power or anywhere near to such a consummation. But it is moving in the same direction, and has just passed through a crisis, in which a decided defeat was given to its anarchistic wing. In Italy, and I understand also in France, we have a singular phenomenon, i. e., to Americans and Anglo-Saxons. Here and in England the trade Unions have been conservative organizations; in Italy they are radical and revolutionary organizations. Here they have been opposed to Socialism and have sharply differentiated themselves from it; there they have been born of Socialism. The difference in temper and method is doubtless due to a difference in origin. Here they arose from economical necessities; there from socialistic propaganda. The result is that there are two kinds of Socialism in Italy: the trade-union type, which is full of class energy and class pride, which really wants nothing to do with the State and believes it can fight its own battles, which would like to meet the whole array of employers with a general strike and is sure it would come out on top, in short, is anarchistic and revolutionary (in the popular sense of those words); and then the type more like that which Jaurès represents in France and of which Professor Ferri is the conspicuous representative in Italy, which believes in working in and through the State and in harmony with civil order, which recognizes the legitimate place and field of trade organizations, but opposes their anarchism, and which while holding to the fundamental ideals (or, as I am compelled to say, illusions and exaggerations) of Socialism, works also for practical reforms. This latter type has itself two wings, one which accepts or at least does not oppose the present monarchy and believes it more important to work for social changes, than for a new form

of government; and the other, much the larger, which is frankly republican and democratic. These two wings, the right and the center, as they might be called of the Socialist Party as a whole, had an overwhelming victory over the left wing (the trade-unionists or syndicalists) at the congress in Rome last October. Let me briefly indicate the situation, for I believe the result is of immense significance for the development of Socialism in Italy and indeed for the order and progress of Italian society.

When the Socialist Party was formed some fifteen years ago there was a definite rupture with the anarchists, and it was supposed that Socialism would be henceforth free from their influence. The vigorous trade unions formed in the northern manufacturing cities under socialist influence claimed, however, to be socialist and were too numerous, influential and powerful to be disregarded. They had their propaganda, their journals and even professors on their side. They unquestionably represented life and vigor in the general workingmen's movement. There was a self-reliance about them that in itself is good. The thing to do for a wise political leader was somehow to win them, recognize them and yet educate them to broader views. Conservative socialists simply opposed them, but Professor Ferri has proved himself a man of political genius. Ferri is a professor of law in the University of Rome. His works on criminology are known to all experts on that subject; he is a scholar, a man of science; yet his practical gifts are equally remarkable. I heard him give a lecture in Florence on "Crime," which showed the practiced speaker, I might say the orator; and he is also a member of the Italian Parliament, held in eminent respect by his colleagues of every shade of opinion, and a practical political manager. Ferri would not, like the conservatives, outlaw the Syndicalists (or anarchistic trade-unionists), he held them in the party and tried to convert them; and he and men like him are converting them. The organizations are strong and growing, but their attitude to law and order is changing; those who represent the old extreme position are diminishing in number — from 7,473 votes which they had at the Bologna congress in 1904, they dropped to 5,278 at the recent congress in Rome. Ferri said he wanted the syndicalists, but not their Syndicalism; and that is just what he is getting. (It is odd, I may say by the way, that the only account of the recent congress in the *SOCIALIST REVIEW* of this country, along with an extended article on Italian Socialism, is written entirely from the point of view of this defeated Syndicalism.) On the other hand, the center or "Integralists" as Ferri's party is called, rose from 12,560 votes at Bologna to 18,000 at Rome, or if addition is made of the votes of the "right"

(or "Reformists," as they are called) there would be upwards of 8,000 more. That is, the Italian Socialist Party stands over five to one against catastrophic, anti-state views.

It is because of this and of tendencies like this that I venture to speak of recent episodes in French and Italian Socialism as examples of progress in the old world. There are, I know, many in this country, very many, for whom Socialism is only a word that irritates. They do not look around it or beneath it or behind. It means disturbance of business, strikes, discontent, insurrection, revolution—all a kind of horrid jumble in their minds. They do not care to hear it mentioned except for denunciation and abuse. It is in just such an atmosphere that Socialism thrives, it is a reaction against it; for extremes breed one another. But from a large, calm and reasonable standpoint—and what is an Ethical lecturer for but to try to take it?—the subject acquires a different aspect. The movements that arise in history are almost always mixed, and truth and error, good and bad, are generally mingled in them. It would be extraordinary if a great popular movement arose in the world, without any basis or reason. If one does not look at Socialism from the standpoint of his personal or class interests, but scientifically, he finds it, and the wonderful growth it is having in recent years, full of significance. It is the working-class rising to consciousness of itself. It is the strong hand and arm saying, "And I too am a man," "I am not for others simply, I am for myself." It is this sense of individuality that is the characteristic mark of the modern world. "We are all to serve," that is the old gospel; "We are all to be served," that is the new*—not indeed so gracious as the old, and a trifle proud, but down at bottom, beneath all exaggerations and extravagances, covering an inestimable element, the sentiment of personal dignity. Woman feels this,—it is the bedrock of the women's movement. And labor feels it and asks that the world be arranged for it as well as for other people. Socialism is simply the exaggeration of this new consciousness of the workingman. It is not absolutely, but relatively a reason for encouragement, a phase of progress. The great matter of concern, the only cause for anxiety, is how the workingman takes the new idea, whether it leads him to isolate himself and antagonize society or whether he is ready to work it out in and with, if not through, society. If he remains in society, if however he may antagonize single elements or classes, he keeps within the limits of civil order, he will by contact and rubbing with others, by experience and disappointment and all the ways we human beings learn, get finally to the truth and right of things

* I do not say that the old gospel is superseded; both are true.

and be a useful member of society. But if he arrays himself against society, if civil order is nothing to him, if law, the conquest of the ages over barbarism, is nothing to him, if his idea that he is the only man who counts in the world he is not to prove by merit, but to put through by force, then are unhappy times in store both for him and society. It is because this is so capital an issue that I took satisfaction in reading about the episodes I have narrated to you, while I was abroad and now take satisfaction in reporting them. They mean substantially that whatever changes are to come in the world are not to violate the old, deep, time-honored principles of civilization. I have no doubt there will come changes, I look for them, I anticipate them in this very realm about which there is so much feeling and hot dispute today. More and more I believe the laboring man is to rise in material and intellectual and moral being; more and more I believe he is to become a full participating member in civilized society. I see in Socialism itself promise. I see in the recent developments of Socialism in Europe promise, for they assure us that the workingman is not to be an outlaw, but one of us, that he is to submit to the restraints that all of us recognize, that he is to learn like the rest of us, that he is to be a new brother in the human household, not a servant, but a man.

WILLIAM M. SALTER.

A Dutch "Nowhere".

AS a rule I prefer to take my fiction separate from my economics and my sociology. That does not mean that I dislike or belittle fiction. On the contrary, I count that year lost during which I do not re-read at least once Dumas', "The Three Guardsmen," George Meredith's, "The Shaving of Shagpat," Dickens' "Pickwick Papers," and Thackeray's "The Newcomes." But I have little use for Utopian romances and socialistic novels. This is partly because Socialism is but the expression of Proletarian aspirations, and the utopian romance appeals mainly if not solely to the discontented bourgeoisie; and partly because the economic teaching of the socialistic novel is usually unsound and mischievous. This is why I have avoided reading a recent novel describing packing-house life—a novel, which so far as I can judge has greatly advanced the noble cause of vegetarianism. Jack London and others have referred to it as "The Uncle Tom's Cabin" of wage-slavery. This shows a total misconception both of the Civil War and of the coming Social Revolution. Humanitarian sentiment did not free the chattel slave; and it will never free the wage-slave. But I do not doubt that "The Jungle" has done much to spread the knowledge of socialism, and I rejoice in it.

In spite of the views I have just enunciated, I am not pig-headed enough to refuse to enjoy a noble work of human genius simply because it happens to glorify a more or less socialistic ideal. Such a work we have in Frederik van Eeden's *De Kleine Johannes*. It has recently been translated from the Dutch, and published by John W. Luce & Co., Boston, under the title of "The Quest".

It is a highly imaginative, poetical book—might almost be called a great epic poem. Like most works of true genius it rebels against the critic's attempt to classify it and give it a label. It is a sort of compound of Barrie's "Little White Bird" (Peter Pan), the New Testament, Pilgrim's Progress, Dante's Inferno, and William Morris's News from Nowhere. But all of these divers elements are fused and blended together by Van Eeden's creative genius. The author shares Ruskin's "strange liking for kings" and distrust of pure democracy. Traces of that Anarchism, which has affected the labor-movement more profoundly in Holland than in any other country, keep cropping out.

There is scarcely a belief known to us moderns that is not subjected to the penetrating but kindly satire of the author.

Early in the book Windekind, who "was born in the cup of a wind-flower", takes Little Johannes to the crickets' school, "but it was not in the least like that which the teacher of his school taught. First came geography. They knew nothing of the parts of the world. They were only obliged to learn twenty-six dunes and two ponds. No one could know anything about what lay beyond, said the teacher, and whatever might be told about it was nothing but idle fancy."

Windekind also took him to see the ants, and an old ant, who was herding plant-lice, gave him some very interesting information.

"The old ant said that they were living under great stress on account of the military campaign which was about to be executed. They were going, with a huge force, to attack another ant colony not far away; to destroy the nest, and to steal or kill the larvae. To accomplish this, they would need all the help possible, and thus they must first settle the most urgent affairs.

"What is the reason for this military expedition?" asked Johannes. 'It does not seem nice.'

'Indeed,' said the herder, 'it is a very fine and praise-worthy enterprise! You must know that it is the Fighting-Ants we are going to attack. We are going to extirpate their species, and that is a very good deed.'

'Are not you Fighting-Ants, then?'

'Certainly not! What makes you think so? We are Peace-Ants.'

'Then what does that mean?'

'Do you not know? I will explain. Once, all the ants were continually fighting—not a day passed without great slaughter. Then there came a good, wise ant who thought it would save a great deal of trouble if all the ants would agree to fight no more.

'When he said that, they all found it very strange; and what did they do but begin to bite him into pieces. Later, came still other ants who were of the very same opinion. These also were bitten into mince-meat. But so many of them kept coming that the biting-up became too much work for the others.

'Then they named themselves Peace-Ants, and all agreed that the first Peace-Ant was right. Whoever dissented was, in his turn, bitten up. Thus, nearly all the ants nowadays have become Peace-Ants, and the remnants of the first Peace-Ant have been preserved with great care and respect. We have the head—the authentic head. We have laid waste twelve other colonies, and have murdered the ants who pretended to have the genuine head. Now, there are only four such colonies left. They call themselves Peace-Ants, but they are really Fighting-Ants; because, you see, we have the true head, and the Peace-Ant had but one head. We

are going, one of these days, to stamp out the thirteenth colony. You see now, that this is a good work.' "

The real hero of the book is Markus, a scissors-grinding Christ, who makes his debut in true biblical fashion promenading on the briny deep. Markus, I think, must be understood as uttering Van Eeden's own views; so that Socialists will want to know what Markus had to say. Markus was present at a big Socialist meeting; the first speech was made by Dr. Fefbeck and was nearly good enough to have been made by Hillquit or Simons. He was followed by an Impossibleist named Hakkema who talked for all the world like R. A. Morris or Knoche. After that Markus arose and said:

"There are fathers and mothers here who know what spoiled children are. The spoiled child that is always coaxed and indulged, like the one that is always constrained, becomes at last capricious, malicious, and sickly.

"Shall we then treat one another as we may not our children? People are flattered by undue praise of their power and influence—are carried away by the sweetness of fine words concerning the injustice they have too long endured and concerning their right to property and to happiness. You all listen to that eagerly, do you not?

"But that to which one listens most eagerly, it is not always best to say. There are hard things to hear, which must, however, be said and be listened to.

"I know that you are not going to applaud me, as you did those two others; but yet I am a better friend to you than they are.

"Among you there are those who suffer injustice. Yet you must not exalt yourselves. You should be ashamed of it. For whoever continues to suffer injustice is too weak, too stupid, or too indifferent to overcome it.

"You must not ask, 'Why is it done to me?' but, 'Why cannot I overcome it?'

"The answer to that question is, weakness, stupidity, and indifference.

"I do not blame you; but I say, blame not others, only yourselves. That is the sole way to betterment.

"Is there one here—a single one—who dares assure me, solemnly, that if an honorable place were offered him by his master, on account of his good work and his good judgment, with higher pay than that of his comrades—that he would, in such case, reply, 'No, my master, I will not accept; for that would be treachery to my comrades, and desertion to your party.' Is there one such? If so, let him stand up."

But no one stirred, and the silence remained unbroken.

"Well, then," continued Markus, "neither is there here a single one who has the right to rail at the rich whom he would hate and supplant. For each of you in their place would do what the rich do. The affairs of the world would be no better conducted were you, not they, at the helm.

"How you delude and flatter and fawn upon one another! You continually hear that you are the innocent, downtrodden ones who have so much to suffer; who are worthy of so much better things; who are so good and so powerful; who would rule the world so well; whose turn it now is to have ease and luxury.

"Men, even if this were so, would it be well that you should always be told it? Would it not make of you conceited fools? Would not the reality revenge itself frightfully upon yourselves, and upon those fawners and flatterers?

"It is, instead, falsehood and conceit.

"You would not rule the world better—you have neither the wisdom nor the charity to do so. You are no more worthy of pity than are your oppressors, for when they injure your bodies they injure also their own souls. The rich are in paths more perilous than are the poor, and it is always better to suffer wrong than to commit it.

"The good things of the earth do not yet belong to you, for you would make the same misuse of them as do those against whom you are being incited.

"Wage war, and desist not until death; but the war of the righteous against the unrighteous, of the wise and charitable against the stupid and sensual. And question not whence come your companions in arms, for you are not the only unhappy ones, you are not alone merciful among men, and goodwill and uprightness are not the exclusive possessions of the poor."

If, after that speech, you can classify Markus (Van Eeden), you can do more than I can; though I think Dr. Felbeck did not come, very wide of the mark, when he said:—

"Comrades, we do not need to ask whence the wind blows. This is one more of that obsolete little band of old-fashioned, citizen (bourgeois) idealists who wish to reform the world with tracts and sermons, and to keep the toilers content in subjection and resignation. Laborers, have you not, I ask, practised patience long enough? Have you, then, no right to the pleasures of life? Must you fill the hungry stomachs of your little ones with palaver about wisdom and charity?"

"No, no!" roared the crowd, freed instantly from the spell of respect under which for a moment they had been held.

"Do not," continued Dr. Felbeck, "let yourselves be befogged by those tedious maunderings that would reason away the strife of the classes. Oh, true! To such the gentlemen of the safety-box (the police) listen eagerly enough, for they are, oh,

so afraid of the War of the Classes! But if they were to hear this gentleman talk, they would shout their approval. Take notice, this gentleman will do much to further it. Of course, they have his medal all ready for him."

"And a pension," added Hakkema (the Impossibilist), while the audience laughed.

Toward the end of the book, Windekind takes Little Johannes a thousand years into the future, and shows him the world of the future. It is a solemnly happy sort of world; there are no end of beautiful air-ships and *no cities*. There is much singing in pure, mellifluous Dutch." Robert Blatchford, in the "explanatory remarks" (Clarion, March 22, 1907), that he appends to his new story, "The Sorcery Shop," points out the difficulty of describing the architecture of the future, and observes: "And I notice that in 'News from Nowhere' even William Morris takes refuge in generalization." Not so Van Eeden; he describes in minutest detail the marvelous buildings in which the handsome, flower-carrying men and women of the future listen to the music of Bach and Beethoven and sing their "pure mellifluous Dutch."

I have two objections to his Utopia: First, it is too far off; I am not going to wait any thousand years; Second, there are five kings, four men and a woman. My democracy might get over the fact of there being kings, as they seem to have no power save such as their fellows yield them on account of their beauty, wisdom and goodness; but I cannot see any use in those four *men* kings. If I have to be bossed by any body, I prefer a woman boss. And if the women of the future are anything like the women I know, one of them can do bossing enough by herself without having four mere men to help her.

If I were reviewing this book for pay for one of our critical (non-socialist) periodicals, I would have to pretend to understand Van Eeden through and through, and proceed to affix just the correct label, and place his charming book on its exact rightful spot on the precise shelf where it belongs. But as I am not writing for pay, but am merely trying to tell my comrades about a book I have found very interesting, I will frankly confess I do not understand Van Eeden and I have not yet been able to make up my mind about his book. That is precisely the reason I ask the rest of you to read it. It stimulates thought on more subjects than any book I have read for a long time. And, after all, the chief value of a book is not so much in the truths it teaches, as in the stimulus it gives us to think out truths for ourselves.

ROBERT RIVES LA MONTE.

April 15, 1907.

Our Bourgeois President.

UNTIL the advent of Pres. Roosevelt, the Republican party was in fact, and almost in avowal, the representative of the large corporations, of what we call the plutocratic or predatory element of the community. It was the avowed friend of the high protective tariff, undeniably a predatory device, to which can be directly traced many of our most colossal fortunes. It was the avowed friend of imperialism and territorial aggrandizement resulting in the annexation of the Philippines, an experiment which involves an immense annual expense or tax on the general community in order that a few favored individuals may enormously enrich themselves by the exploitation of the people and the natural resources of these island possessions. It was the tolerant friend of the trust in the form we know it; that is to say, of the privately owned trust or industrial combination for the purpose of keeping down expenses and wages and keeping up prices and dividends.

In its slogan of "four more years of the full dinner pail" it was the ostensible friend of the laboring man, a slogan which was proved to be hypocritical by the counter slogan of "stand pat" on the evils to which the intelligent working man objected. But even when it was ostensibly for the working man, the promised benefit was an indirect one dependent on the direct benefit through special privilege to the capitalists. A dinner pail, full or empty, was still contemplated for the laboring man. In other words, the implication was that the prosperity of the working man depends on the prosperity of predatory interests which fundamental economic laws do not bear out.

In 1896 was the great Bryan campaign. This campaign is often loosely thought of as a struggle between the plutocrats and the working classes. But this is not so. It was a struggle between the plutocratic element on the Republican side and the middle class element on the Democratic side, with the working class or proletariat divided. The plutocratic element consisted of the money lords and industrial barons with their interminable horde of personal lackeys, business retainers and subsidized moulders of public opinion. They secured a large proletarian vote on the well advertised threat that, if Bryan were elected, mills and factories would close. This threat, sophistical though it was, appealed strongly to the immediate economic interests of the laboring classes.

Bryan also received a large proletarian support but it was as truly emotional, that is, non-rational and unintelligent, as the proletarian vote for the Republicans. The laboring classes did not understand the silver question any more than Bryan did himself. They liked the sound of that fallacious slogan "free silver," but they could not really see how they were to get any more of it in the event of Bryan's election. They did not understand the trust question any more than Bryan did himself, but they were against the trust because it was a concrete and a convenient object of execration.

But the middle classes, the small merchant, the small manufacturer, the farmer, and many of the jobbers, to say nothing of the silver interests themselves, were somewhat more intelligent. Bryan appealed to them more clearly and directly. These are invariably the people who owe money, who owe definite fixed sums measured symbolically in dollars and cents; who almost invariably owe more than is coming to them; who have purchased on credit; who have borrowed from the bank against their stock, their integrity and their local reputation for being able to do business at a profit, and who depend upon future profits for the liquidation of these debts. It matters not to them whether prices change or not. They can readily adjust themselves to such changes. But if they have definitely promised to pay dollars and are authorized by the law of the land to return something less in value than the dollar borrowed, they can see a direct economic advantage to themselves and are willing to work for it.

The middle class also viewed the trust question with greater discernment. They know better than anyone else whom the trust is injuring, for it is the middle class which the trust is destroying. The trust, per se, has little if any effect on the rate of wages. But the small merchant whom the trust gradually forces to the wall by cut-throat competition, meets his tormentor face to face. The farmer or stock raiser who finds it ever more difficult to market his product owing to the practice of the railroads of charging what the traffic will bear, and who, having reached the market with their goods, are forced to deal on the terms fixed by the trust, meet their tormentors face to face. The travelling salesman who, by his industry and pleasing personality, has built up a territory, knows that he must lose his job and seek new fields because the trust has no longer any need of salesmen. These men are against the trust. They may not have the shadow of an intelligent idea of how to proceed, but they are against the trust. It menaces their very existence. Of course the whole middle class did not at that time nor does it now fully

realize what was going on and many were influenced by other considerations, but we can only deal here with the type. Bryan said he was going to do something to the trusts and so they were for him.

The Bryan wave was a new departure for the Democratic party. It is true that Cleveland had promised to do something on the tariff question, but he did not do it, and he was thenceforth classed as a plutocrat or plutocratic Democrat. With the advent of Bryan, the out-and-out plutocratic Democrats revolted and formed the ephemeral Gold Democratic party.

With slight modifications, the relative standing of the parties remained in statu quo until the death of McKinley and the accession of Roosevelt. We now view Republican partyism cast in a new role. To be an ideal Republican, one must be safe, sane and conservative; a stickler for form; an adept at glittering generalities; a respecter of senatorial and other diplomatic courtesies, and a shouter for the Grand Old Party, right or wrong, first, last and all the time. Theodore Roosevelt was not an ideal Republican. He possessed very few of these attributes. He was an iconoclast, a rough-rider, a bold hunter, impulsive, strenuous and uncertain.

A highly interesting spectacle was this new president and especially after the election of 1904 when he had received an overwhelming popular endorsement; democratic in his instincts, plutocratic in his environment and bourgeois in his viewpoint. The Democrats recognized this change in Republican candidates and sought to take advantage of it by the nomination of Parker who was almost insulting in his plutocracy. The hoped for plutocratic support did not go to Parker partly because they saw it was no use to try to elect him and partly because they feared his election would involve the defeat of many at a time-tried Republican office-holder.

The situation had become completely reversed. Roosevelt, the bourgeois, was the candidate of the plutocratic party; Parker the plutocrat, was the candidate of the bourgeois party.

Aside from the silver question which even Bryan now admits to be dead and which he practically had abandoned as early as 1900, there is scarcely a hair's breadth difference between Bryan the Democrat, in 1896, and Roosevelt the Republican in 1906. If Roosevelt denies this, certainly the Bryan followers will not. I recently heard one of the most prominent Bryan shouters remark to an old line Republican, "if we couldn't get the man we wanted (meaning Bryan), the next best thing was to elect the man you didn't want." Many Bryan followers delight in calling themselves "Roosevelt Democrats" and it is a matter

of frequent comment in the press that the radicalism of 1896 is the conservatism of to-day.

It is undoubtedly true that Roosevelt has proceeded much the same as Bryan would have proceeded. This is especially true of the trust question. Before Roosevelt, the attitude of the Republicans was in no wise inimical to the trusts. For instance, Senator Hanna, the leading plutocratic politician of the last decade, never admitted that the trust, per se, was bad. He used to say there were good trusts and bad trusts. Bryan does not admit there are any good trusts, while Roosevelt, without making any general statements, proceeds indiscriminately and impotently against one or two of the more conspicuous trusts.

But admitting that many of our evils are directly traceable to the trustification of our industries, there are proposed two methods of dealing with it; first, by regulating, to the point of destruction if necessary, the trust, and, second, by letting the government, the people, acquire the ownership of them. It is on the unanimity of their methods in dealing with the trust that the similarity of Bryan and Roosevelt is most clearly seen. Bryan, while not specially stating just how he proposed to deal with the trust, has made the significant, if actually meaningless, statement that the people should not engage in industry that can be safely left to private individuals. Roosevelt has said the same. In action, Roosevelt has brought a few suits, resulting, in some cases, in fines and, in most cases, resulting in fizzles.

This manner of dealing with the trust is distinctly bourgeois. It is the attitude of the small business man and the small jobber who are being crushed, as such. Some few indeed there are of these who gain affluence by securing high positions in the trust that absorbs them, but most of them are pushed down into the ranks of the mere salaried proletariat. But whatever else may be claimed for this method of dealing with the trusts, it certainly cannot be claimed that it improves in any way the condition of the proletariat. Even if it should keep down the cost of living, it does not keep up the nominal wage, the actual wage being the ratio of these two factors.

Not only in this one instance, however, do President Roosevelt's bourgeois characteristics depend for substantiation. In the settlement of the coal strike, he took the side neither of the coal barons nor of the strikers. He stepped in when the "consumer," a popular approximate synonym for the middle class, was threatened. It was the interest of the "consumer" alone that he insisted should be conserved. He enforced a compromise not because the coal barons were making too much and not because the workmen were making too little, but because the middle class ob-

jected and demanded coal. That both parties to the dispute were forced to make concessions was merely incidental.

So in the railroad rebate question. This question does not even get so far as the consumer. On its very face, it is simply a quarrel between the privileged, plutocratic, big shippers, the trusts, and the small shippers, the bourgeoisie. An eradication of the rebate system will not affect prices of commodities for, whatever concessions the small shippers may secure they will put in their own pockets. Nor has the giving or withholding of rebates any permanent effect on the rate of wage and therefore it can in no sense be called a proletarian measure. The railroad rate squabble is in fact merely a three-cornered fight for profits between the small shipper, the big shipper and the railroad or when, as often happens, the big shipper and the railroad are practically identical, it becomes a duel.

Likewise, in the recent agitation over the frightful conditions at the Chicago stock-yards, President Roosevelt again arrayed himself on the side of the middle class, the so-called consumer. President Roosevelt read "The Jungle" which depicted powerfully the awful crushing of the submerged human beings in the meat industries, but this phase of the work received practically no notice from him. If it is dangerous and nauseating to eat meat prepared in such an environment, how much more dangerous and nauseating it must be to work there. A bill was passed, not to enable the workers to get better meat at the same price or the same meat at a lower price or to get higher wages, but to enable the packers to regain the lost foreign markets for American meat products.

The bourgeois attitude of the president is again shown in his periodical farcical efforts, through Secretary Shaw, to keep down the interest rate by "coming to the relief of Wall street." It is not the plutocrat who borrows money. He owns the banks and gets it for nothing without borrowing. It is not the day-laborer who borrows money (except in insignificant sums from the usurious small fry of money harpies), for he has no credit. It is the small business man, the small capitalist, the bourgeoisie, who borrow money against their stock and their capital in order that they may work up to their full efficiency. That the so-called "reliefs" of Secretary Shaw are really of benefit only to the market manipulators by furnishing them opportunities to shear fresh crops of fleece is beside the present question. But at least it may be said that Secretary Shaw has never pretended these monetary aids to have any effect on the wage rate.

President Roosevelt has been praised for his advanced stand on the tariff question, although he has apparently relaxed his

efforts in this direction. But this, as before, concerns only the middle class. The rate of wages is not involved. The best proof of this is the fact that in free trade Great Britain, as well as in other free trade countries, the condition of the proletariat is fully as miserable as in this country, if not more so.

This is not written in a hostile or partisan or fault-finding spirit. I do not mean to decide whether these things ought to be or ought not to be. I only say they are. I am not deciding whether in the absolute, President Roosevelt is right or wrong in his attitude. Absolute right or absolute wrong is most elusive. On the contrary, it may be admitted that President Roosevelt is right from his viewpoint. The contention here is that his viewpoint is that of the bourgeoisie.

In an economic sense, the United States has, until recently, been considered distinctly a bourgeois country, the country of glorious opportunities for the man with small capital, or even for the man with no capital. We had no class lines, no caste, no royalty, no titles, no landed or other aristocracy. This was our pride and our boast. But that condition, if it ever even approximately existed, has past. In addition to a large middle class, we now have a definite industrial and commercial aristocracy together with its necessary concomitant, a large proletarian class. Class lines have developed here and are as readily recognized by anyone who will take the trouble to observe what is going on, as in the older countries where they have always been universally recognized.

When the phenomenon of class lines exists or arises, the desideratum is not to perpetuate, but to eradicate them. The proper function of government, unquestionably of democratic government, is to administer for all classes so equally as to completely prevent or abolish classes. Our task as suffragists is not to choose officials who will represent and protect the interests of one class to the exclusion and at the expense of other classes, but to choose officials who will represent all classes without favor, that is to say, the whole community, irrespective of classes. If President Roosevelt is wrong therefore, it is because he represents the middle class to the exclusion not only of the proletariat, but oftentimes of the plutocrat as well. A house divided against itself cannot stand and there is no more certain an indication of a house divided against itself than the phenomenon of class lines.

Where there are two or more classes, there is a constant shifting in respect of those composing them and the attributes by which the different classes are distinguished and identified. The nearest exception to this rule may be found in the castes

of India and other Oriental countries, but even in these places, there is always a slight movement and, furthermore, the character of this movement is typical of the general character of all similar movements. An individual passes almost invariably from an upper to a lower class or caste. This is obviously true, for position in an upper, better or stronger class depends on the possession of certain mental or physical powers or superiorities. To acquire this power or superiority is as a rule, manifestly more difficult than to lose it. If one possesses the requisite power there is always the chance that someone may deprive him of it or that he may otherwise lose it. If he does not possess it, or has lost it, it is most likely lost irrevocably. This at least is the law of our present competitive society. Whether or not it will ever be different is another matter.

The erection of this house divided against itself is due to the prevalence of certain superstitions, customs, laws, regulations and the like, which may have been deliberately adopted and eminently fitted to conditions at the time of their adoption or which were insidiously propagated by the predatory few. If the former, the time comes when they have outlived their usefulness. If the latter, their usefulness was never greater than that of any other barnacle or parasite.

The falling of the house divided against itself occurs in two sections or stages. In the first stage, the lower exploited class, now by far the largest class in the community, becomes conscious that it is a separate and distinct class and that it is an exploited class. This discovery naturally produces a desire to find the exact superstition, custom, device, law or regulation which is responsible for their being thus set apart and exploited. The second stage in the falling of our house divided against itself, the crash, occurs when a sufficient number have decided the real cause and united in a determination to remove it.

To apply these generalities to the United States, it may be said that we started at the American Revolution as a community of no classes (exclusive of course of chattel slaves). So long as the country was relatively undeveloped and so long as methods of development were slow and crude, class lines were relatively slow in forming. But the multiplicity of inventions and scientific discoveries has sent development forward in geometrical progression and class lines have recently formed very rapidly. Starting therefore with a no-class community, the first change we notice is a preponderating middle class flanked on either side with a small upper class and a small lower class respectively. As time goes on, we see the upper class increasing

slowly in numbers but tremendously in power and influence. We see the lower class increasing tremendously in numbers and destitution alike, while the middle class we see growing steadily smaller until it is completely absorbed.

At present, the upper class is readily recognizable; the middle class while still holding the balance of power, is already approaching its exit; and the proletarian class although already very large, is just beginning to be conscious of its own existence.

Returning now to President Roosevelt, we may say that he is not only wrong ethically, in representing one class to the exclusion of the others, but, more important yet, he is attempting the impossible. He is attempting, whether consciously or unconsciously, to preserve the middle class, a feat which cannot be performed.

His failure is already manifest. When he was elected, it was expected that he would do great things and undoubtedly he himself fully expected to do great things. He talked much and promised much, but he talked and promised without an economic understanding. He saw far more clearly than most men that things were wrong but he knew no more than most men what to do about it. Have he and his methods been given a fair trial? The answer must be emphatically in the affirmative. As men go, Mr. Roosevelt is a strong active, powerful man, a forceful and aggressive character. If anyone could have made the bourgeois measures effective, he could.

But he has failed. After trying more than five years, he has failed utterly. During all that time only a few ineffective measures were put forward as an offset to the enormous daily concentration of wealth in the hands of the few. The watering of stock continues unchecked. Trustification flourishes as never before, even the one or two of the biggest and more conspicuous trusts that have been threatened with the mythical big stick. The cost of living has increased steadily and the increase in the nominal wage has not begun to keep pace with it. It is questionable whether there has been an increase even in the per capita nominal wage.

And worse for President Roosevelt, the people have commenced to realize that he has failed. Although they still show him a passive respect and admiration and believe him well-intentioned, his name no longer arouses a fighting enthusiasm in the breast of the average man. They know that words will not buy food and clothes and that unfulfilled promises are only fit for hell pavements. The most significant incident in proof of this growing popular dissatisfaction, was the recent futile attempt to resuscitate Bryan. This was a movement on the part

of the middle class, not to get a man who would make promises different from those of Roosevelt, but to get a man whom they thought and hoped could and would fulfill the same promises. When he undertook to promise more, namely, the collective ownership of a few railroad lines, they dropped him as they would a viper.

I have excused President Roosevelt on the ground that he is ignorant of the real problems that confront him. Others no less able to judge than I, excuse him on the ground that he is the unfortunate victim of an environment totally hostile to his ideas, namely, a Republican Congress. Either of these explanations may be true without changing the facts, but the placing of the blame on his environment, brings us to the consideration of another very important point. How does he come to be in such an environment? Be it remembered, Roosevelt is not the Republican party, nor does he represent the Republican party. Mr. Roosevelt as the candidate of that party is an accident pure and simple; and accident which the party managers and political manipulators were unable to foresee and were powerless to avert. He is the leader of a mutinous host and the Republican party will never again be led by a man of his characteristics. The Republican party is plutocratic. Roosevelt is bourgeois. He would be an ideal candidate for the Democratic party which is also bourgeois.

A further proof that Roosevelt is essentially bourgeois and, in this case, almost a proof that he is consciously bourgeois, lies in the fact that he positively recognized the proletariat class and the proletariat political movement by issuing in his last message, a note of warning against Socialism, the only political movement that is avowedly proletarian. This is the first time that the word Socialism has ever been used in a presidential message, a most significant fact, especially in view of the late Senator Hanna's pronunciamento on the same subject.

Senator Hanna was the shrewdest and most far-seeing politician of the last decade. Shortly before his death he recognized the early extinction of the middle class and the middle class political movement, when he said that the next great political struggle in this country would be between the Republican party and the Socialist party. When that time comes class lines will obviously have been deeply and vividly drawn. The middle class will be but a memory. The plutocrat and the proletariat will for the first time be thoroughly class-conscious and, the proletariat, being greatly in the majority, will be triumphant.

ELLIS O. JONES.

From Parliaments to Labor Unions.

Certain socialists of late have made noteworthy efforts to give a conservative character to the materialist conception of history. For that matter, it may be said that it is the fate of all theories touching on the so-called moral sciences to be utilized equally by the most diverse partisans. The Hegelian doctrine of the reasonableness of all which exists, and the reality of all which is reasonable has, for example, long served the reactionaries to show the absurdity of the reformers and revolutionists, just as it has served the latter to show the reactionaries their inconsistency. If, indeed, that which is real is thereby rational, the political and moral constitution of present society is fully vindicated and the revolutionists by rebelling against it rebel against reason and human nature. But, on the other hand, if all that is rational is at the same time real, then every abstract doctrine which is true before the tribunal of reason is entitled to count among practical realities, and, therefore, to overthrow the existing order of things.*

In historical materialism as in the Hegelian dialectic itself there is a conservative side and a revolutionary side. The conservative side is the justification of the present social order by the existence of the forces which assure its power and its development. Thence may develop that insipid positivism of common sense which condemns most indignantly every attempt to change the social order, which is justified by the pure and simple fact of its existence. Moreover, in affirming the vanity of every revolutionary attempt when the conditions for the transition from one social form to another are lacking, aid is given to the interested verdict of a disguised conservatism against the historical anticipations of all those who are oppressed and outraged by the established order. Naturally this conservative materialism which loves to attach itself to socialism, (indeed, that is its favorite disguise), carefully refrains from indicating any possible method for ascertaining when the "conditions" of the revolutionary process exist or do not exist; otherwise the conservative character of the system would not be evident.**

* This little by-play in dialectics is cleverly set forth by Engels. See "Feuerbach," Lewis's translation, p. 40.

* In the system of historical materialism the existence of the condition or conditions which make likely and probable the transition from one political or social form to another can only be established by the very fact of the success or failure of the revolution. Hence the necessity of resorting to revolutionary action and awaiting its results. Hen-

The greatest danger for humanity's future in this tendency is, that it leads to the belief that the social process will accomplish itself automatically and inevitably, prevailing through its own strength over all obstacles opposed to it by interest, greed, or ignorance. In practice it results in counseling the abandonment of all conscious and voluntary influence upon the social organization, and every attempt at resistance to the movements of the conservative classes and parties. In a German socialist review Mr. Kolb wrote as follows: "We trust ourselves to the organic development of things. We seek in every way to influence and accelerate this organic development. The strength of our conception of socialist tactics is, that it is a theoretical transposition of evolution. We must fearlessly proceed to its conclusions, in order to dispel the contrast which exists to-day between our tactics and the catastrophical theory. *Hic Rhodus, hic salta*. "Around this point the whole discussion turns." Confidence "in the organic development of things" means to renounce all revolutionary action. Take away the misty German formulas and the meaning is: socialism makes itself by itself. In fact, another German socialist writer has not failed to draw from these premises all the conclusions which they imply. He is led to advise the renunciation of any action at all in the event of the rulers and the conservative parties taking away from the laborers what little liberty they still have. Listen to David on this point: "But if, unhappily, on the peaceful way which leads the proletariat to power they were to try to stop us by repressive measures and corner us for a decisive struggle what should we do? We should answer illegality by legality, violence by calm. That is the only means of crushing violence, the only resource against bayonets. All the weight of moral condemnation would thus fall upon those who attempted by violence to set themselves in the path of the civilizing march of the social democracy."*

Now this strange and repugnant tactic of cowardice which certain persons would recommend to the proletariat comes precisely from the macaronic interpretation of the law of social evolution which they assume to derive from historical materialism. Vliegen** affirms pompously that "the victory of socialism will result from the actual process of economic evolution," and he adds with sententious and pedantic brevity that if the resort to violence

riette Roland-Holst well says: "The superior organization of a class aspiring to victory like the disorganization of a declining class, is proved only by the result, that is to say, by the combat." (*Generalstreik und Sozialdemokratie*, Dresden, p. 13).

* *The Conquest of Political Power*. Edward David in the "Socialistische Monatshefte," 1904, 1. vol., p. 206.

** "Neue Zeit," 22d year, vol. 1, No. 2.

on the part of the ruling classes can do but little harm, such a resort on the part of the proletarians may do much.

The practical consequence naturally is to fold our arms over our breasts and trust ourselves to divine providence. Only, in view of the fact that since Adam's sin man is condemned to eternal labor, these brave socialists advise and propose to the working man to kill time by voting. As for those socialists who take voting more seriously, they are equally careful to attach their little conceptions to historical materialism, which latterly has become a convenient pass-key to doctrines of extreme absurdity and actions of extreme opportunism. Since historical materialism implies a theory of transition from the condition to the conditioned they conclude that socialism presupposes a series of institutions already formed, by means of which the laborers provide for their existence, and that their own role is to favor, thanks to their parliamentary activity, the development of everything which may prepare for the triumph of the working classes. Pacific tendencies, personal vanities, and interests of the proletariat, all these seem marvelously well met on the electoral and parliamentary field, and they have developed an overweening confidence in the use of electoral methods such as never classes or parties had before. Thus have arisen all imaginable species of socialism, practical, positive, and well-meaning. This piously electoral socialism, doubtless in order to give scope to the humorists of the bourgeois and anarchist parties, and perhaps to set off its slightly faded beauty, has exhibited itself under the title of "Scientific Socialism." Everything is science now, even to the trade of pulling teeth, and here in Italy we rejoice in a "Scientific Police Review." *

It is very difficult to imagine how a system so essentially bourgeois in its nature, its history and its origin, as the parliamentary system, could become an instrument of emancipation for the proletariat.

The parliamentary system is the reflex and the natural condition of existence of a political society lacking in all economic homogeneity, whose members, I mean, have divergent or opposite economic interests.

Capitalist society is constituted in such fashion that all the component members of the capitalist class find themselves in the state of natural competition. The only interests common to all the members of that class are relative to the preservation and the safeguarding of their respective original social possessions, that

* Except for the convulsive plunges which are beyond all foresight and all rule, and which are sometimes the final resource of history at bay, there is to-day for socialism but one sovereign method,—to gain over the majority legally. J. Jaures, quoted by H. Lagardelle, "La grève générale et le socialisme," p. 113.

is to say, they are relative to public order and private property. This class has thus been obliged since its first appearance in history to solve the problem of the organization of the public powers in a way to render impossible any favoritism, and any abuse of power on the part of the state. The parliamentary system, permitting a strict and severe control of public expenditures as well as of all administrative acts, is certainly the most adequate solution of the historic problem which the capitalist class had to solve. By this means it has succeeded in realizing a relative neutrality on the part of the state in the conflicts which arise either between the members of the ruling class or between it and the oppressed class; and the law upon which capitalist society rests, that is to say, competition, has thus been able to acquire all its efficacy. This system of the neutralization of the state, realized by means of the equilibrium of parties, which in a certain measure, (but often indirectly, or ambiguously, or not at all) represent classes or fractions of classes, this system, where it has reached its highest perfection, has given birth to democracy, that is to say, a political organization which considers all citizens as equals, whatever may be the original economic positions occupied by them, and which, consequently, on the basis of political equality, maintains rigorously all social inequalities. A society whose members have no common interests must naturally take the parliamentary political form. Moreover, all history, as we may say, is an experimental proof of this affirmation, that for the capitalist class the parliamentary system is the adequate form for its political rule. All the documents of the Third Estate, on the eve of the French Revolution, proclaim, almost without exception, that law ought to be the expression of the nation, and that the nation ought to make its wish known by means of elective assemblies meeting regularly and deliberating freely, sheltered from any molestation by royal decree and military force.* Now, if the parliamentary system arises spontaneously upon the entrance of dominant social groups, there is no homogeneity of interests as came about in England between the nobility and the crown, and if such is the normal and natural condition of the capitalist classes it may be concluded that the parliamentary system is, so to speak, the essential and inevitable form of their rule.

Now, we are told that the proletariat is also, on its own account, interested in eliminating all private influence from the state, and that to this end it employs the parliamentary system,

* In his history of the French Revolution Jaures amuses himself by taking a few shots at Taine, but the latter has shown an understanding of the revolution certainly superior to that of Jaures, who undertook to find the whole revolution in the purely factitious framework of the elective assemblies to which the revolution itself gave birth. Jaures seems not to have understood that the Revolution "is neither the Assembly nor the Convention."

participates in its life, and contributes toward its proper functioning. But this conception takes us far away from the idea that this same proletariat is going on to demand of the parliament more than it can give and proposes to impose upon it tasks that are contradictory to its nature and its history.

Parliaments are not and cannot become the organs of a social revolution. At the very best they can only act in a formal manner. The mechanism through which they work seems, moreover, to exclude the possibility for one class or one party to obtain a decisive majority to the exclusion of all others. It is said that the proletariat forms the great majority of the population. The fact is possible, yet there are mistakes in the figuring. Experience will prove that the socialist party, sooner or later, will have to give up enrolling employes in the public service, and no one has ever discounted the possibility of organizing in the socialist party the countless mass of domestic servants and slum proletarians of the great cities. A considerable portion of the non-proprietary rural population has no interest in promoting a social revolution or taking active part in it. Many agrarian contracts, farming on shares for example, establish a real partnership between the proprietor and the laborer. Naturally all these groups will also experience the benefits of the socialist revolution, and it would be a childish fear to believe that tomorrow they might form a re-actionary mass interested in destroying the order of things founded upon the principles of socialism. But for the moment it is foolhardy to suppose that they have a collective interest in promoting a social revolution. Moreover, the relations which are formed between them and the capitalist class develop in them sentiments of personal attachment for their masters. Again to-day it happens that even in districts and electoral colleges, composed in great part of workingmen reached by an extensive socialist propaganda, a manufacturer of the district, nevertheless, succeeds in being elected. Corruption, personal attachment, the qualities of the candidates, the religious sentiments and training of the voters very often balance the pure, attractive virtue of political theories. For my part I do not hesitate in considering as the most ridiculous and most absurd of Utopias the idea that the socialist party can ever, in any country of the world, obtain a majority of the parliament. The least that could happen to it on such an occasion would be to see all sorts of divisions arise immediately within its own body.

And then, that would assume this impossible condition, of a capitalist class peaceably letting itself be dispossessed of its political preponderance. I do not think that the bourgeoisie ever wishes to suppress the right of suffrage. The parliamentary system being a condition of life under capitalist rule, it will last as long as the government of the bourgeoisie itself. In coun-

tries politically backward where the sentiment of political labor is little developed, as in Germany, there may, I think, be produced some momentary reactions, the initiative of which will be taken up not by the capitalist class, which in Germany does not govern effectively, but the caste of the Junkers or the court. But from this eclipse it may be foreseen the parliamentary system will emerge strengthened, and Germany itself will be modeled politically upon the more western countries. And who can tell what marvelous historical changes may follow the political transformation of Russia, where everything points to the opinion that the revolution can triumph only under the form of a real democracy of radical type? But what is passing in all parts of the world, in the most autocratic countries as in the most democratic, from Russia to the United States, is a proof of this truth, that hereafter the repression of the movements which compromise either the existence of bourgeois society, or even some privilege, simply, of the bourgeoisie, can easily be accomplished without striking at the general liberties of the citizens. This is an indirect but a very pertinent proof that the relation of means to end does not exist between democracy and socialism. The most democratic and the freest countries of the world provide for the maintenance of the capitalist order with an efficacy quite equal to that of the most autocratic systems.

Democracy has, as yet, no grasp upon the actual process of social life. It is characterized by incompetence. When Spencer observes that members of parliament are generally ignorant men, he exposes not a defect but a condition of the existence of democratic regimes. It is the duty of these, so to speak, to provide their citizens with the fundamental conditions of existence. To maintain all rights and social relations,—this is the sole function of democratic regimes. Everything that transcends the sphere of abstract civic relations depends on the creative spontaneity of the social spirit. Every time that a parliament or a democracy has a desire to bring into being some economic institution, it has been obliged to resign its powers into the hands of technical commissions, and to create special administrative organisms. If so many public enterprises turn out so badly, the reason is the fundamental incompetency of their organizers. The social revolution which must realize the *autonomous control of production by the associated working class*,—which is the very aim of socialism,—is, first and foremost, a technical and economic fact, consequently it cannot be decreed by an assembly of incompetent people, but must result from the autonomous development and the spontaneous initiative of the producers themselves. A technical and economic transformation of production with all its later social transformations decreed by a parliament of lawyers, doctors, chiropodists, novelists, poets and . . . econ-

omists, is the most extravagant idea which ever took root in a human brain.*

There is a better way. Every social revolution, if it is not to caricature itself, takes on certain appropriate organs. When once the bourgeoisie had really assured its political dominance, it gave birth to parliamentary democracy. And where parliamentary democracy does not exist it may be said that the bourgeoisie has been obliged to resort to a compromise with the ancient society. Now, in general, the established powers of a given society never lend themselves to any transformation without considerable reluctance. They resort to half-way measures which remedy nothing. And experience proves that if the existing legal powers consent to introduce reforms it is almost always in the interest of the very classes or institutions which need reforming. We shall even see that reforming is synonymous with conserving, since it implies a respect for the existing legal organization.** The revolutionary instinct leads all classes which enter on a conflict with those in power to adopt a wholly autonomous organization or social mechanism within the existing political society. The doctors in socialism were not yet born when the proletariat had fashioned for itself in the trade union its instrument of revolution.

But the working-class movement at a certain moment suffered a strange eclipse. The union appeared as a secondary organ in its relation to parliamentary activity. The penetration into the bourgeois state and the conquest of the legal majority were considered as the equivalents of socialism. The bourgeois state was erected into a redeemer of the working class. We disowned that long historical tradition, never till then contradicted, that the reformatory efforts of the established powers always show themselves illusory and dangerous, usually resulting in the consolidation of the classes whom it was sought to disposses. Socialist reformism forgot all its ancestors of bourgeois reformism. And taking no account of the lessons of their experience, it preached to the proletariat as a new truth what was but the reproduction of a very old error.

The capitalist class, for its part, has fully grasped the value of the reformist movement. So long as the working classes,

* "To reform in capitalist society is to affirm private property." G. Sorel. *Introduction à l'économie moderne*. Paris, 1904, p. 11.

** "In Germany and Russia the bourgeoisie attempted to come into power and abolish feudalism by the classic reformist methods. In Germany the abolition of serfdom led to a shameless expropriation of the peasants and the nobility remained in power. (V. Kampfmeyer. *History of Social Classes in Germany*, Berlin, 1896, p. 110 et seq.) In Russia it had no better success at shaking off the yoke of the ancient feudal aristocratic organization. (V. Piekhanoff. *Tachernichewsky*, Stuttgart, 1894. *Introduction*.) History is filled to overflowing with such examples.

forgetful of the natural necessities of every revolutionary movement, instead of considering the union as the specific organ of the revolution, instrument at once of attack and defense, base their hopes on the results of universal suffrage, the bourgeoisie slumbers soundly. It is in no danger. Even admitting what is unlikely, that a socialist majority might reach the parliament, parliamentary life is such that this majority would soon be dismembered into rival parties jealous of each other and incapable of an agreement on the end and means of the programme that they might propose to realize. A dim sense of this truth seems to penetrate into the soul of the most resolutely reformist of the socialists. On the morrow of their famous electoral victory where they had gathered three million votes, the German socialists, for whom the parliamentary illusion is at least justified by the absence in their country of a real parliamentary system, seemed overwhelmed by their own triumph. "What will happen tomorrow," they asked themselves, "shall we see the coup d'Etat, the suppression of universal suffrage, the return to pure absolutism?" There is a certain humor in the situation when a party, which proposes to arrive at the complete emancipation of the proletariat by the use of legal institutions, is reduced to concerning itself about the eventual loss of these legal institutions, and about the means for reaping all the gain of its first victory.

To trust, as so many do, to the natural course of economic evolution for the necessary realization of socialism is to play pitiably with one's own powerlessness. If the doctrine of historical materialism really suggested such an attitude, its falsity would be definitely established, but it is, on the contrary, a revolutionary doctrine, since it implies this teaching, that history is a product of the conscious will of men, a will which works, no doubt, upon definite historical data and which, consequently, is limited and circumscribed both by the natural and the social environment but, nevertheless, a creative will. The fundamental principle of historical materialism is, in fact, that men are the creators of their own history. (Vico.) It is men who, with their passions, their instincts, their ideas, the education which they have received, *make* their history. No doctrine gives so much importance to the idealist forces as does the doctrine of historical materialism, precisely because it considers history as an eternal flowing and becoming, that is to say, as the unpredictable result of the conscious though contradictory effort of men constantly to emerge from the social conditions in which they find themselves. It looks upon men as being subject to an incessant revolutionary education which engenders in them the perpetual need of outgrowing their present situation, and of realizing an ideal of a new life. And it admits by implication that men subjected to a permanent anti-revolutionary education

are, more or less unconsciously, led to accept passively the existing state of things, but what education is more anti-revolutionary than that which advises men to renounce any conscious or voluntary attempt, any anticipation beyond present reality, any individual effort against this established social order?

History is a constant process which finds its immediate motive power in the will and the feelings of men. The conditions of the social environment represent the inert matter which limits, by its resistance, the power of progress of the individual and collective genius. How and by what way this progressive power forms itself, this is determined by the social relations in which men find themselves involved in the course of their social life. Our feelings, our passions, and our instincts are produced, positively or negatively, by the social organism in which we have to pass our existence. This explains the great importance of the institutions by means of which men must develop. The life of the laborer gravitates around two poles, the workshop and the union. And to understand the laborer's psychology and his ideology it is sufficient to observe these two institutions. The factory is, in a certain sense, present reality, the union, the reality to come. The factory represents productive association, the union, the organism in which is formed the working-class justice of the future. The laborer's ideal is an economic society organized purely and simply with a view to material production, and from which has disappeared every hierarchy not demanded by the technical division of labor, that is to say, a society without a state, without prisons, without an army, without laws, organized on the single basis of the economic necessity, the compact and the technical discipline of the factory.

The laborers must struggle to impose upon the world the rule of equal legal privilege, which flows necessarily from the life of the union, and an organization of society of an essentially trade-union type, that is to say, purely a matter of contract, and resting upon the single basis of the technical participation of men in economic production. To this trade-union organization capitalist society opposes the political organization of men, in other words, their subordination to the state, an organ foreign to civil society and transcending it. We need only reflect on this opposition to understand the truth of Sorel's statement, according to which the struggle for the emancipation of the working class can very well be represented, and in fact is developing, as a struggle between the political power of capitalist society, which is the state, and the technico-economic organization of the producers, which is the union. The realization of the specific ideal of working-class socialism presupposes the decline and the dissolution of every political power and of every non-economic form

of organization; namely, the progressive and gradual elimination of the state.*

From Parliaments to Labor Unions. Such is the watchword of the labor movement, entering upon a new phase; that is to say, from the utopia of reforms, obtained thanks to parliamentary compromises, to the reality of the revolution, pursued by the methodical extension of the acts of unions and the gradual elimination of every political influence. The laborers see in elective assemblies only a means for controlling the acts of the administration and observing the maneuvers of the capitalist parties, a means of control and a vantage ground with which they could not dispense without great damage to themselves. The truly revolutionary work they accomplish in their unions, which must lose the character of simple trade organs looking only to the amelioration of the labor bargain, to become organs of the collective interests, contingent or general, immediate or future, of the whole working class.

But to reach this result, the working class must make a great effort. It must learn to free itself from all the bourgeois protectors who offer their services. It must arrive at understanding the true nature of the reformist movement, and separate itself resolutely from it. The reformist movement is the last political disguise that bourgeois conservatism has succeeded in wearing, with some success. Either the working class will succeed in banishing it to the bourgeois storehouse of cast-off clothes, or it will be our destruction. Such is the dilemma.

ARTURO LABRIOLA.

Translated by Charles H. Kerr.

NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.

In publishing this article it should hardly be necessary to remind the readers of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW that we do not necessarily endorse the opinions expressed by contributors. The present article appeared in *Le Mouvement Socialiste* of Paris for December, 1906. The writer is not the author of "Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History," but the leader of the Syndicalist wing of the socialist party of

* That parliamentary action also has certain advantages is undeniable, if we reflect on the harm that the Catholics, for example, have done themselves in Italy by their abstention from voting, and on the difficulties in the midst of which the anarchists have always struggled, incapable of commanding the respect of public opinion and of protecting their common rights as citizens. On the other hand no revolutionary party can renounce the use of existing institutions, for the simple reason that this use is a necessary condition for the existence of a party. Parliamentarism is a fact which it would be senseless to pretend not to know.

Italy, who is referred to on page 338 of the REVIEW for December, and on page 388 of the REVIEW for January.

We are reprinting it, not because it seems to us a wholly adequate discussion of socialist tactics in Europe, and still less in America, but because it is an admirably clear statement of a view which is finding supporters on both sides of the Atlantic.

As the views expressed in this article have been appropriated though not assimilated by our American "impossibilists," it may be worth while to call attention to two or three considerations which have been usually overlooked.

In the first place, the European syndicalists, as represented by Labriola, do not regard political action as useless but, on the contrary, point out that it would be insanity to throw away so important a weapon as the ballot.

Again, the balancing of divergent economic interests which in Europe prevents any one party from obtaining a parliamentary majority does not exist in the United States. The great capitalists here exercise an almost undisputed sway, and the immediate prospect for the future is the disappearance of the small producers as a political factor. The contest will then be in the open, between the trusts on one side and the laborers on the other.

Finally, the trade unions of continental Europe are distinctively socialist bodies, organized and controlled by members of the socialist party. In this country, on the other hand, the existing trade unions are largely controlled by "leaders" who are still coquetting with the capitalist parties, while the attempts thus far made at organizing a distinctively socialist trade union have been ill-advised and unfortunate. American trade unions are, as yet, decidedly conservative, and to regard them as the main instruments by which the social revolution is to be accomplished simply shows a failure to understand the real conditions of the problem that American socialists are trying to solve.

C. H. K.

The Origin and Classification of the Stock Faker.

THE daily press of the United States has, of late, been carrying an unusual amount of matter concerning mining stock speculation and mining stock frauds. Several magazines have also undertaken to discuss the matter as a particularly live topic. Some of the writers know what they are talking about and some of them do not; some of them are sincere and others are clearly actuated by the remarkable fact that the New York stock exchange has really confessed to the interference of the present mining boom with the designs of its own members, many of whom have felt compelled to handle mining shares in order to make a living.

Possibly it remains for the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW to take a glimpse of this subject from the point of view of the socialist philosophy. In this I can perhaps render it some aid from my own intimate observation.

Before doing so, let me dip into a few generalities for the purpose of connecting up the trend of my remarks with the broader aspects of social conditions, for it will be apparent that this subject is not new, after I am done. While not wholly essential to the purpose of this discussion, let me say that, in general, the divisions of "business" activity are as follows:

First. The industries that are productive of the fundamental needs of society and the raw materials with which men work.

Second. Manufacturing.

Third. Commerce.

Fourth. Finance.

Fifth. Intellectual pursuits.

All of these overlap and interchange their functions to a greater or less extent. It is my aim to deal predominantly with the classification, finance, and by so doing, to arrive at the classification "faker."

The realm of finance is essentially that of investment and credit, the congealing of money (popularly called "capital") in fixed works or schemes and the loaning of the same to others at interest for the ultimate purpose of congealing it as aforesaid. As I use the terms, the difference between a "capitalist" and a financier is that the former invests his own money, while the latter invests the money of others.

Credit is commonly controlled by the banks, or large interests intimately associated with the banks, such as insurance companies. Investment, through financiers, is now usually marshalled by the aid of the corporation—that bastard image of co-operation. Banks use the savings of the people to accumulate profits, both from loans and from investments in which they participate. It must be borne in mind that a bond is a credit instrument, while a certificate of stock is an instrument of investment.

Promotion—a quite modern word—is the process of creating or organizing an investment opportunity, usually by means of corporations. The difference between a promoter and a financier is that the former erects or assembles the enterprise represented by the investment, while the latter handles funds only. It very often happens that both functions are joined in a single individual, as, for example, J. P. Morgan, or some other person who carries the high-sounding title, “banker and broker.” The position of the stock broker, pure and simple, is a subordinate one.

Let us now look back and witness the inevitable crowding out of the many from the commercial class, either backward into the ranks of the proletariat or into the possible wilderness of new beginnings, in those parts of America where the individual may still retain, to some extent, his productive individuality. What I am dealing with here is the crowding forward process, by which I mean the last grand struggle of some self-devoted individual to postpone his fall into the class of wage-earners. This individual wishes to remain “respectable,” and perhaps he is too old, too little educated or too intelligent to become a doctor, a lawyer a minister of the “gospel,” so that he cannot overleap the realm of finance and drop into an intellectual pursuit and he lands right in the middle of the temptation to become a promoter.

In connection with this “forward” movement may be mentioned the “backward” tendency of many professional men, who are forced by the crowding of these pursuits to drop into the realm of finance. I know a large number of such cases.

Let us recur now to that division of finance which comprehends investment, and right here I wish to mention the business of real estate speculation and brokerage, just to show that I am not neglecting it through ignorance, but rather through design. This business falls partly in the realm of finance, by way of speculation, and partly in the realm of commerce, broadly speaking, by way of the purchase of city lots and country lands for a relatively useful purpose. Besides, there are many instances of realty corporations, whose stocks are

widely outstanding. I am also neglecting grain speculation, etc.

There are three important means by which social capital is assembled in the shape of money for investment purposes. First, through the banks; second, through the insurance companies; and, third, through promotion financiering. As already indicated, banking is supposedly a credit function, and so also to some extent, is the handling of insurance company funds; but in both cases stocks are often important assets, the relative amount of such depending upon the policy of the particular bank or insurance company. Moreover, there are many banks and insurance companies that, indirectly, at least, support promotion operations. The syndicate operations of New York bankers and insurance officials are familiar phenomena. Lastly, promotion schemes are regularly carried on, independently of banks or other large financial institutions.

If we may divide promoters into two classes, the "big" and the "little," we may follow this by saying that "big" promoters are very apt to be underwriters, operating by the aid of syndicates, in which the general public is not permitted to participate; whereas the "little" promoters are compelled to go more directly to the public. The one class underwrites its promotions and lists its stocks, perhaps, on the stock exchange, the companies being "financed" to start with; while the other goes before the country in order to procure funds to make a beginning. In the first case, the initial funds are already available, because the "big fellows" are wealthy and they control the funds which the public has deposited in banks or paid into insurance companies. In the second case, the desire of the chief functionary is to draw out of the banks the savings of the country and assemble it for the purposes of his enterprise, assuming that he is at all sincere. If he is a mine promoter and there happens to be a mining boom in progress, he may list his shares on a mining exchange and thus borrow an important cue from his "big" brother. The large amounts of money recently taken out of banks for this purpose have caused a good deal of "indignation."

Now it happens that the small promoter has one advantage over the large one. In assembling his initial funds from widely distributed sources, he can command the terms more easily and it is easier for him to deceive at this stage of operations than can the man who trusts for his initial funds to a lot of shrewd banking or insurance officials, who usually dwell close to the source of all financial wisdom. Consequently, the usual method of ham-stringing the public on the "big" deals is through the stock exchange. Such operations have been made generally familiar by Thomas W. Lawson, and that gentleman did tell the truth as it is understood among the esoteric.

On the other hand; there is only a limited opportunity for the small promoter to make use of stock exchange devices, so that, if he is disposed to do any ham-stringing, he must seek elsewhere for his methods. The end of all promotion is attained through the trusteeship of funds, and while the "big" promoter may defile his trust in one way, the "little" promoter may defile his in another. The administration of the public's funds, represented by hundreds or perhaps thousands of insignificant contributions, furnishes, when once in his hands, a comparatively easy opportunity to abuse his trust. The corporation laws of the United States are notorious for their laxity, on the investment side, and a hydra-headed government adds only to the confusion.

"Little" promotion, good or bad, thus furnishes a very convenient outlet for the "respectable" person who refuses to become a proletarian and has found himself unable to be anything else. This individual has read the Success Magazine and grown to admire the types of self-made financiers that that journal sometimes describes. Consequently he falls readily into this class, and other similarly-minded persons follow him. They take with them many satellites, for the business requires much clerical assistance and the pay is usually good. The writer of this article was once such a satellite, and he knows.

I do not wholly condemn the stock faker. In some respects, I admire him, for while he may be too ignorant to become a socialist, he is at least ambitious enough to want to be as well off as his pew-neighbor at Sunday morning services.

The suggestion of the pew-holder recalls to my mind a certain good Methodist of Ohio, who by chance found himself buying mining stocks, about which he knew nothing. Later he assumed a local agency for a western promoter, and later still, he drifted west and set out to "promote something" on his own account. He organized what he called a securities company and sold stock rather widely, its avowed purpose being to earn dividends by procuring meritorious shares in producing mining companies or by speculating in the rise of active issues. Some time ago, I had occasion to examine a list of "securities" which this company counted among its assets, and discovered that the good Methodist had unloaded upon it a trunkful of absolutely worthless shares, probably left over from the days when his own stock ventures were as green as the June hills of Ohio. This citation illustrates how easy it is to "administer" the funds of one's clients into one's own pockets.

But promotion must have an excuse; and where is it to be found? The "big" interests have so concentrated manufacturing and commerce that there are now very few normal opportunities in these fields. The little fellow must turn to the uncertain-

ties, for these also supply an element of mystery and romance. Perhaps he will take up a new though untried invention, which, by reason of the great fortunes that have been made from such discoveries and devices, supplies the mesmeric motive force to attain the much-desired trusteeship of funds. Co-ordinate with invention, we find that mining has been an important source of great fortunes, and this fact—combined with the romantic uncertainty of mining, especially gold mining,—supplies a very taking excuse for promotion. It will thus be seen that this very considerable contingent of “respectable” persons, who refuse to become proletarians and are unable to become anything else, turns naturally to the fundamental realm of industry, namely, that which deals with initial productivity. Agriculture is not often chosen, for reasons that Mr. Simons can explain, though it happens that a great many plantation companies have been floated, usually based upon tropical lands, both because they are remote and because they retain a degree of mystery.

Gold-mining is probably the least useful of all mining activity, and, in this connection, it may be noted that the trust promoters manifest very little disposition to concentrate the control of gold and silver production, except indirectly through the smelter combine. The concentration of control over initial production is confined mainly to copper, lead, zinc and iron, all useful metals. The enormous production of gold is already frightening the world, and when I say the world, I mean everybody except the promoter, his clients and their bourgeois sympathizers. Nevertheless, it happens that productive gold mines usually fall under the control of limited interests, often the very men who have been made wealthy by them, but more often those who are already well-to-do or are in close touch with wealthy persons. It frequently occurs that such mines are “promoted” or “under-written,” as in England, for the purpose of placing them on the stock exchange, in which cases the general public runs a grave risk of being ham-strung or it does not enjoy a very considerable return upon its “capital.”

The great maturity of “little” promotions in the mining field are based upon unproven enterprises, ranging from bare prospects to properties that are pretty well developed but are in need of equipment. Gold enterprises predominate, but there are many that are admittedly based on silver-lead and copper prospects.

The hazards of prospecting are naturally very great, from a financial point of view, although the possible rewards are likewise very tempting. It thus happens that the stock faker is very apt to be actuated by a consciousness of the hazards, while he expects the general public to be actuated by the possibility of great rewards. The stock faker looks for his returns through

the administration of the funds, just as the bankers and the trust promoters do. The man who longs to "promote something" is not apt to care much about the outcome, for promotion, like virtue, is its own reward.

One other distinction is necessary. There are many honest efforts made to promote mining prospects, and successful ones, too, but they diminish in frequency as they increase in distance from the base of practical operations. The result, or perhaps, the cause, is that the stock faker is commonly a resident of the city. In fact, all finance is an excrescence of concentrated population. It is only "respectable" to live in a city, and the larger the city, the more "respectable." The cost of living in New York City, for example, where financial fakes are perpetrated in large numbers, makes necessary the extravagant costs of "little" promotion, whether it believes itself to be sincere or not. The result is, that enormous "rake-offs" are the rule.

By reason of certain facts, already pointed out, it will be apparent that "little" promotion works no tendency toward industrial concentration, except as an incident to the development of prospects and the casual making of mines, which centralized interests are gradually controlling in the case of the useful metals and to some extent in the case of the so-called precious metals. Neither can it be said to promote financial concentration to a very great degree. Such promoters seldom grow very rich, as they are usually lavish with their money, and I have known some who have finally landed in the ranks of wage-earners, usually as clerks, bookkeepers or assistants for other promoters.

It would be interesting to estimate the relative amount of faking activity in the United States, but it would be as difficult as it would be interesting to compile such statistics. We are all aware of the fakes of the manufacturing and commercial realms, prominently illustrated by adulterated food-stuffs, and in this respect some figures have been put forth by the government. But in the realm of finance, I know of no comprehensive or accurate data. I once had occasion to examine the corporation records of Arizona, a territorial commonwealth which, by reason of its easy laws, is a favorite place for incorporators to secure charters. I then found that it was turning out about seventy new mining companies a month, but I believe that the number is much greater today. The average capitalization may be roughly placed at \$1,250,000, but mining stocks are usually sold at from one cent to twenty-five cents per share. I have no doubt that the aggregate capitalization of mining companies put forth during 1906 greatly exceeded one billion dollars basing the capitalization on the average selling price of shares, instead of the

par value. The total mineral production of the United States largely coal and iron is more than one and a half billion dollars per annum, but a large part of this is not capitalized and that which is capitalized is already controlled by centralized interests, leaving the bulk of the new stock capital to be represented by fakes and failures.

To me, however, the chief interest is not in the amount of faking but in the number of fakers, for it is here that we find the sociological bearing of the subject. I have already pointed out the usual origin of the stock faker, who by accident of birth or education is loath to forgo economic independence. He will be found in the cities and is ultimately to be classed with the large number of useless or semi-useless persons that inhabit these centers of population. I cannot venture an estimate of the number of persons who are, as principals, subordinates or semi-assistants, maintained through stock faking or insincere promotion, but I can guess that the number corresponds approximately with that of the habits of the tenderloin districts in the cities. The one gives rise to about as much "moral" indignation as the other.

I have taken occasion to look up the figures of the United States census, bearing upon the subject of the personal occupations of American citizens. Taking the percentages of increase in the various divisions of personal activity, I find that the largest increase from 1880 to 1900 was in the case of street railway employes, that is, 520 per cent. Second to this comes 386 per cent, representing officers of banks and corporations, and third, bankers and brokers, who showed an increase of 283 per cent. Next in order come manufacturers and manufacturing officials, 252 per cent, and commercial travelers, 228 per cent.

When it is remembered that the street railway business has grown enormously since 1880, it is easy to understand how street railway occupations stand at the head in the given percentages of increase. But after that comes the realm of finance, comprehending banking and corporation officials and "bankers and brokers." While a great many of the occupations so included are useless, from the point of view of the socialist, a much smaller part can probably be considered insincere or fraudulent, in the light of bourgeois standards and bourgeois ignorance. Nevertheless, if it were possible for the census to gather statistics bearing upon unscrupulousness in business I am certain that the figures would show a very pronounced increase in the percentage of downright fakers in the stock business, especially within the last ten years, within which the stock buying has gained greatly.

It may seem that I have ascribed unwarranted importance to the hand-to-hand shiftings of petty capital, but the subject suggests both a claim upon one's sympathies and a possible

ground for congratulation. Not only do the facts set forth indicate the desperate unscrupulousness of the faker class, but they are also symptomatic of the ignorant longing of the wage-earning victims, in many cases, to attain by quasi-cooperative methods what they may yet welcome through genuine co-operation. Such men as Judge Peter S. Grosscup harp continually upon the idea of "peopleizing" the industries through the medium of financial associations, and this idea may have some advocates who believe it to be part and parcel of the development toward socialism, but, glad as I might be to behold the complete fruition of the Grosscup ideal, I confess that I can see no hope for socialism by that route. The corporation laws of the United States are the chief stumbling block, and their very weakness is rather an aid to the progress of concentrated control, along the lines recognized by the socialist program.

L. C. M.

EDITORIAL

The Battle at Boise

By far the most significant event of the month from the point of view of the working class has been the clearing of class lines in the battle over Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone. Until recently it has been impossible to force the defenders of the Mine Owners' Association into the open but the fight has grown so hot that they have been compelled to take a definite position. The most striking exemplification of this is of course President Roosevelt's reply to the Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone Conference of Chicago in which he designated the accused men, together with Comrade Debs, as "undesirable citizens."

Had this event taken place six months ago it is probable that the President would have carried an overwhelming proportion of sentiment along with him even among the workers. But the work of education that has been carried on by the socialist and labor journals has so changed the situation that in every corner of the country there were found persons who responded instantly to this attack and took the side of Moyer and Haywood.

One of the most gratifying features of this phase is to be found in the fact that on the whole the trade union movement stood firm. It was more than would have ordinarily been expected. There is no denying the fact that there are men occupying positions of power in trade unions who are both corrupt and ignorant and who for either of these reasons would be glad to take the side of capitalism in such a fight, but so strongly had the current of working class sentiment been set in favor of the accused miners in Idaho that these ignorant or corrupt leaders realized that treason to them at this time would be treated very much as scabbing is during a strike.

By the time this reaches our readers the legal battle in Idaho will probably be on although there is already talk of another continuance. Around that court room is now centering the greatest

fight of the last decade. This fact in itself changes the whole character of the struggle. In the beginning there is no doubt but what the mine owners thought that they could spirit these men away from their homes and lynch them judicially with no more of an uproar than had been caused by equally nefarious and murderous acts in other places. This time, however, they calculated without taking into consideration the fact that it is always some single final act no larger perhaps than thousands that have gone before that releases the pent up forces that have been accumulating for years. So it was here. Steadily the wave of resentment and protest has grown among the working class until it now embraces millions to whom the very names of Moyer, Haywood or Pettibone were unknown even one year ago. This fact puts an entirely new face on the matter.

In the beginning the only hope of capitalism lay in secrecy. That hope is gone. The telegraph companies centering at Boise are putting in facilities to handle such an amount of news matter as has seldom been sent out from any city of the United States, and when the case of the people of the state of Idaho versus William D. Haywood is called there will probably be as great facilities for publicity as have been found at any event that has taken place in the United States for years. The fact of this publicity coupled with the definite stand taken by Roosevelt and the capitalists now takes the struggle out of the legal realm and makes it a test of strength between the two great forces that are contending for power in every great capitalist country.

There is no question to-day but that capitalism is in the saddle and the fate of the three men in Idaho depends entirely upon whether those in control of the capitalist machinery of government decide that they will be less dangerous if dead than alive. There will be no secrecy. Whatever is done must be done now in the full glare of publicity and this fact at once spells danger and hope. The ruling powers will fear either to release or to execute these men. Yet to judicially lynch them in the blazing light that will beat upon any scaffold that may be erected in Idaho might easily sound the death knell of capitalism itself.

There has been a tendency on the part of many socialists to become somewhat hysterical over this affair. There is no doubt but that the events are enough to arouse the strongest emotions possible in every member of the working class but it is not emotion that accomplishes things, at least not in as complex a society as the present. Passing by at once those who talk about violence with the remark that such talk at the present-time is the most valuable asset possible in the hands of those who are seeking the life of the Western Federation of Miners, it is a noteworthy fact that there are other suggestions little less dangerous. One of these which con-

stantly comes up is that of the general strike. We do not say that the general strike is not a valuable weapon in the hands of the working class when it can be used but with the present organization of labor and its present attitude to talk of a general strike is as useless as to talk of organizing a regular army. Any number of general strikes might be called but no one would obey the call. Of course this does not say that if the struggle continues to draw more and more forces to it, the time might not come when organized labor might reach such a stage of indignation that it would spontaneously revolt against the attempted murder of our Idaho comrades. At the present time, however, such talk does little more than put weapons into the hands of capitalism which can be used more effectively than any corresponding weapons with which we can reply. The struggle itself is not educative, at least certainly not to a sufficient degree to prepare workers for any constructively revolutionary action. It is a sudden blow and a powerful weapon to be used to accomplish an immediate result. Where anything constructive is aimed at, anything requiring a preceptible length of time for its action, the strike leaves society in the midst of the inevitable reaction which always follows such violent movements at just the time when constructive energies are most needed.

There are other less dramatic but much more effective means of working at the present time. The extension of the work of agitation and the organization of the workers for the capture of government is something which is much more feared by the capitalist class than any threat of a sudden outbreak either with physical force or economic action. This work is not spectacular. It does not give any an opportunity to pose as martyrs or heroes, at least not at present, although it may do so in the future but it is a work which is most effective in meeting the present crisis. There will be no sudden action in Idaho. The legal machinery which has been set in motion will take months to grind out its results and those months will give time for that widespread intelligent revolt of the workers which is much more effective than any momentary outburst.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

No single act of any public official in recent years has created such widespread consternation and indignation as President Roosevelt's malicious declaration that Debs, Moyer and Haywood are "undesirable citizens," and thus intimating that their removal by aid of the hangman's rope would be a public blessing. That the assault upon the defenceless Idaho prisoners was deliberate and premeditated is unquestioned. There was no connection, directly or indirectly, between the plutocrat Harriman on the one side and the miners' officials on the other. Roosevelt simply quarreled with his former pal Harriman. The latter proved to the satisfaction of every disinterested citizen that he had raised a quarter of a million dollars to boodle New York state in Roosevelt's behalf. The President, driven into a corner, cries out in rage, "Liar!" Then, in order to break the force of the sensational expose and to divert criticism from his own political immorality, he resorts to the contemptible trick of a jack-knife lawyer and makes a cowardly attack upon menaced prisoners four thousand miles away! Some papsucking politician at the Washington pie-counter once made the queer remark that Roosevelt is "the greatest President since Lincoln," and some of the snobs and office-seekers looking for favors have repeated the disgusting mouthings of a fawning lackey. It is unnecessary to refer to any of the demagogical administrative acts of a general character of Roosevelt to question whether they will live in memory until he retires from office. His specific acts concerning labor far overshadow and outbalance anything that he has done or can do in a general way to perpetuate his name as a statesman. Stripped of all the flamboyant claims, the cold fact stands out in bold relief that Roosevelt has been the most consistent and merciless, though hypocritical, opponent of labor that ever sat in the Presidential chair. Roosevelt is hailed, and properly so, as "the father of the open shop" by every Parry and Post union-smasher in the country. It was through his meddlesome and autocratic dictation in the government printing office and the anthracite-miners' strike that the open shop issue spread over the country like wild fire and encouraged the labor-haters to make war upon organized labor. Those unexpected and unnecessary blows have caused the unions losses of millions of dollars and thousands of members. His coarse diatribes aimed at workingmen and their representatives who demanded that the contract labor and eight-hour laws be enforced on the Panama canal are too well known to require repetition. His cheap ridicule of men who demanded a square deal in the injunction abuse, and that laws be enacted to prohibit capitalistic courts from taking sides against striking laborers, is only emphasized by his un-

seemly scramble to dictate his successor in the person of the ponderous Taft, "the father of injunctions," who sandbagged unions out of their hardearned money to assist employers and who actually went to the extreme of enjoining tailway employes from exercising their Godgiven right to quit work when they chose. Many other incidents might be mentioned to show that Roosevelt's whole career has been one of persistent antagonism to the working class, and so his contemptuous attack upon the Idaho prisoners is not inconsistent. The thug Gen. Sherman M. Bell of bull-pen fame, is his personal friend, and the politicians and plutocrats of Colorado and Idaho are his retainers and supporters. The fact that many of the persecutors of Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone are said to have been uncovered by a federal grand jury as land thieves and grafters on a gigantic scale will probably make little difference to the "greatest President" who is said to have shot Spaniards in the back and wrote in a book that drunken and debauched cowboys on the frontier are better citizens than law-abiding mechanics in the cities. But it is quite likely that the vulgarmined Roosevelt has overreached himself, and that the temporary craze that turned his head will disappear more rapidly than it gathered force. There is hardly a labor paper in the country that has not denounced the President for his shameful act, and many of the capitalist papers have done likewise, while unions throughout the land have adopted resolutions by the hundreds condemning the prejudging of the miners. "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad."

The action of the A. F. of L. executive council, at the recent quarterly session, in commanding the United Brewery Workers to give up the engineers, firemen and teamsters or lose their charter has aroused renewed interest in this celebrated case. The brewery workers' officials have submitted the mandate to referendum vote with the recommendation that it be rejected and that the members prepare for war. This defiance was not unexpected and the members would hardly retain their own self-respect if they permitted their union to be disorganized without a fight. Gompers has been unrelenting in his persecution of this international organization because the brewers persist in standing upon their charter rights and in safeguarding their interests by admitting all men employed in breweries to membership. For seven or eight years the brewers have been marks in Federation conventions for every form of abuse and denunciation because they refused to be chopped into craft organizations, but stand for industrialism. It has become the popular thing for Gompers' cabal to take a kick at the under dog at every opportunity, and while howling at the brewers one moment in the next they prostrate themselves before the miners, who also accept engineers, firemen and teamsters in their organization. And some of the people for whom the brewers have done the most are the loudest howlers against them. It is admitted throughout the union labor world that the brewers are the most liberal organization in the Federation or outside. No union in distress has ever appealed to them in vain for moral or financial assistance. Just for example: A certain organization had a hard fight on in Cincinnati. The international treasury was practically bankrupt and it was difficult to pay strike benefits. The men were clamoring for money to purchase food and clothing and satisfy the landlord. In desperation the officer in charge of the strike rushed over to brewers' headquarters and ap-

pealed for a loan. Without even polling the members of the national executive board, the brewers officials wrote out a cheque for a thousand dollars, handed it to the strike leader and said: "Come back when you need more!" One would think that a brotherly act of this kind ought to arouse some sense of gratitude, but the chief mogul of that international union, who was not on the firing line in Cincinnati, has never missed an opportunity to "throw the hooks" into the brewers, and his delegation in conventions always votes as he dictates. Yet while the great "leaders" are in a conspiracy to pluck the brewery workers to pieces, the rank and file are inclined to stand by them. This was demonstrated in Columbus, O., Pittsburg and St. Louis recently, where strikes were waged by the brewers and the jurisdictional controversy was injected. In Columbus the delegates in the Trades Assembly almost to a man stood by the brewery workers, when along comes an A. F. of L. organizer and revokes the central body's charter and starts an opposition show. The local movement was split, and it was only by threatening to call in their charters that several unions of other trades joined the new body. Yet the brewers defeated the bosses and their allies, the labor dis-organizers. In Pittsburg it was reported that Secretary Morrison, the father of the crazy scheme to embroil the city central bodies in the jurisdictional hair-pulling, declared that he would supply men to take the places of members of the brewers' union, but nevertheless the latter won. Morrison is a narrow Prohibitionist and has cultivated a strong hatred for the brewery workers for obvious reasons. It is claimed that he is really directing the fight against the latter because Gompers has been very busy arranging for the peace talk-fest with Carnegie and other Civic Federation duties. The brewers expect to be expelled from the A. F. of L. and they make no secret of their intention to return blow for blow. Better to go down fighting like men, they say, than to surrender like cowards and be dis-membered. There are a number of international unions whose members will demand that they withdraw from the A. F. of L. if the brewers are dumped, and the action is sure to precipitate trouble in many city central and state bodies throughout the country. I know of a number of city central bodies in the smaller towns which will go to pieces if they are compelled to expel the brewers. They are having a hard enough row to hoe under present circumstances.

It will be remembered that mention was made in this department several months ago that while the printers were engaged in a deadly contest with their national employers' association, known as the United Typothetae of America, to enforce the eight-hour day, and were steadily gaining ground despite all obstacles, President Higgins, of the pressmen and assistants, an ardent craft autonomist and who usually presides at Federation conventions when Gompers is re-elected, sneaked into a conference with the bosses at Philadelphia and signed an agreement providing for the open shop and postponing the introduction of the eight-hour day in pressrooms until 1909. I say sneaked advisedly, for last year's convention of the pressmen in Pittsburg instructed Higgins to co-operate with the officers of the bookbinders, and at the latter's request, in negotiating a new national agreement. But when the time came to meet the "master printers" President Glockling, of the bookbinders, was deliberately snubbed by Higgins, who went into session with the bosses, entered into his treasonable compact and then came forth and informed

Glockling, who was keeping warm in the lobby of an hotel by kicking his heels together, that he (Glockling) might be able to make the same arrangements—open shop and eight-hour day sometime—if he preserved due humility and forgot his radical notions. Glockling swore like a trooper and informed Higgins that their trade unionism was of different brands. However, he submitted Higgins' handout to referendum and recommended that it be buried, which it was at the ratio of 16 to 1. Last month the bookbinders' international executive board met in Columbus, O., and filed notice on the "master printers" that they would demand their eight-hour day on October 1, 1907. Meanwhile Higgins is having a merry time of it. From one end of the country to the other the local unions are condemning the sell-out in strong terms, and delegates to the convention in New York next month are being instructed to repudiate the agreement and demand the eight-hour day immediately. Indeed, Higgins is in danger of being dumped overboard along with his shameful contract. Nevertheless Higgins is an extraordinary individual (at least in his own estimation). While he is being roasted to a turn in the official organ, the American Pressman, by the rank and file, Higgins is turning on his critics and delivers himself of as fine a line of talk as ever came out of Boston. The following sample will show what great labor leaders can do when thoroughly aroused, and that it may not be lost to posterity this masterly and poetical outburst should be duly recorded. Says Mr. Higgins:

"Our Portland correspondent seems to be guilty of limous lingual limosis of litotes, which appears quite evident in his discovery of a cursoriness among the membership over his latest productions in the columns of our official journal and appears to be a clear case on his part of coagulation of the protoplasms. We advise him to erudite more sagaciously in his inquisitiveness of lamentations, by coming to our next convention and finding out all about it. Or, he will be likely to be considered by many as an Zany, of the lachrymose kind, or an Zarnich, from among the hills of that far-away section by those who know him, and those who know him not.

"This also applies to our Washington correspondent who so zealously embarks in an enterprise of trying with the aid of others to deprecate through the genus, taking a species all of his own that are regrettable through their Phlegmagouge of Phlegm, but who exist nevertheless in trying to effect a quondamship of the victim of their dislikes.

"We beg to remind them, however, that 'they alone are immune from Cephalo-Genesis who have butted the wall three times and perceived that the wall fell not.' Blest be the man who first invented sleep."

SOCIALISM ABROAD

RUSSIA.

For the moment the Russian Revolution centers around the struggle between the Douma and the Autocracy. The government strength in the Douma is very weak but the socialists and the Group of Toil and the other divisions of the Left have refrained from giving any grounds for the dissolution of the Douma in order that it may for a time at least function as a legislative body. At one time this policy seemed about to be broken when a socialist, M. Zuraboff, made a fierce attack on the army, declaring it to be worthless in repelling foreign attack and only valuable for crushing the working class at home. For a time it seemed as if the Douma would be dissolved, but matters were finally patched up and the Douma remained in session.

FINLAND.

Readers of the Review have followed the struggle for universal suffrage in Finland and know the part played by the socialists in attaining that right. The first election has just been held under universal suffrage and the result is another red spot on the map of the world. The socialists cast 268,000 votes and elected 83 representatives. The reactionaries who made up the next strongest party had only 54, the conservatives 47 and the agrarians who on many points will act with the socialists have 13. This gives Finland the honor of having the largest percentage of socialist representatives in parliament of any nation in the world.

An interesting phase of this subject is in the fact that owing to the strong socialist influence universal suffrage was made really universal and included women also. The socialists nominated a number of women for legislative seats. This forced the other parties to do likewise and consequently 18 women will sit in the new parliament, 9 of them as members of the socialist party.

ENGLAND.

The past month has been one in which several European parties have held their annual congresses; that of the Independent Labor Party was one of these. The most important decision of the congress was the one to support the parliamentary fraction in their advocacy of a limited suffrage for women. There has been much criticism of this action among the working class and many of them consider it a distinct abandonment of the revolutionary position.

HOLLAND.

The Socialist Party of Holland held its annual congress at Haarlem on April first. An attack was made by a small fraction who claimed to be the only genuine Marxians upon Troelstra and the general party management, including the editorial policy of the *Het Volk*, the daily paper. It was alleged that there was a tendency towards revisionism and dropping of the Marxian position. Troelstra replied to his critics claiming that this was not true and that members of the so-called Marxists had had free access to the columns of *Het Volk* and that there was no tendency towards revisionism. He was supported in this position by a number of speakers and the following resolution was adopted by a vote of 226 to 11 with 14 not voting. "The congress, after giving the due consideration to the accusations that have come from many party members against the principal organ and the majority of the party, considers that those who have made these accusations have not brought forward proof and therefore rejects the accusations and denies the statement that the party is divided in two groups of which one has the true insight and tactics and from which the other deviates toward the bourgeois side, and express its complete confidence in the organ of the party and declares itself in accord with the present tactics. The congress appeals to the socialist conscience of all party comrades to cooperate in comradelike work, and with reciprocal confidence in the common struggle against capitalism."

SWITZERLAND.

The Swiss Social Democratic Party held its annual congress at St. Gall in the last week in March. The financial condition of the party was shown to be very poor. There are only about 11,000 paid up members, and were it not for the fact that the central treasury of the Grütliverein had been placed at the disposal of the party, propaganda would have been seriously hampered. It was agreed that dues were at present too low and would have to be raised and that extra efforts must be made towards extending the organization of the party.

ITALY.

The internal struggle in the Italian socialist party has broken out again in spite of the fine resolutions of the last congress. Turati has recently published a severe attack on the party organization and management especially directed at Ferri, the present editor of the party organ *Avanti*. The result has been an outbreak in all the party organs of a fierce controversy which is still continuing. Turati claimed that the party organization was weak, that the members in parliament were not attending to their work even to the extent of being present when they should have been. It is, of course, a revival of the old struggle which has been going on in the party for many years. A special meeting of the representatives of the party has been called to consider the present crisis.

VICTORIA.

The Socialists of Melbourne report concerning the meeting of the Socialist Party of Victoria:

"On Wednesday, March 6th, the party held its half-yearly meeting at Elizabeth street. There was an attendance that filled the hall, and although the agenda was a lengthy one every item of business was transacted, including the election of officers.

Since the commencement, 18 months ago, 1808 members have been enrolled. The propagandist meetings during the past six months were over 300. The Prahran struggle stimulated the agitation very considerably and eighteen of the comrades were imprisoned in connection therewith, and several fined.

The Sunday School has nearly doubled its scholars during the half year.

The speakers training and elocution classes have been increasingly successful.

The socials and the Sunday afternoon teas have been most successful, and altogether profitable.

The children's dancing, calisthenics, and club swinging classes are developing quite satisfactorily.

The total receipts from all sources, other than co-operative trading and co-operative shares were, for the half-year ending Feb. 28th, £1166 18s. 1d.; the expenditure was £1156 13s. 3d. The profit on the income was £561 14s."

BELGIUM.

The Socialist Party of Belgium held its national congress in April. The one great question still agitating the Belgian working class is the necessity of getting universal suffrage. There is a general feeling that little can be accomplished until this step has been gained and in order to secure this end it was decided that it will be necessary to maintain the alliance with the Liberal party as a first step towards universal suffrage. This position was supported by Vandervelde but met with strong opposition. Bouccare opposed the movement on the ground that it would injure the trade union movement which was replied to by Anseele, the great trade unionist, who declared that the truth had shown the reverse; that where the policy of forming alliances with the Liberals had been carried on the trade unions had entered into them heartily and that after all everybody realized that these alliances were only for the moment and for the single purpose of obtaining a weapon with which to work.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, By Karl Marx. Translated by Daniel De Leon. Charles H. Kerr & Co., Paper, 78pp., twenty-five cents.

This analysis of the French phase of the Revolution of 1848 has long been recognized as one of the best examples of the application of the Materialistic Interpretation of History by the discoverer of that theory. This is especially the story of the counter-revolution under Louis Napoleon, and the various squabbles between the large and small capitalists for power. As an analysis of the working of class-struggles during an extremely complex period it must always remain one of the most valuable pieces of Socialist literature.

The Right to be Lazy, by Paul Lafargue. Translated by Dr. Harriet E. Lothrop. Charles H. Kerr & Co., paper 46 pp., 10 cents.

Like the above this is a reprint of a well-known and valuable Socialist classic. Nowhere does the genius of Lafargue shine more brightly than in satire, and this is one of the best examples of that art. Alongside the old "Right to Work" he places the infinitely higher "Right to be Lazy," or the right to have and enjoy leisure and determine the method of spending one's life. There are few more effective propaganda pamphlets than this today.

The Spirit of Labor, by Hutchins Hapgood, Duffield & Co., Cloth, 410 pp., \$1.50.

Hutchins Hapgood came to Chicago to "look for a man" and seems to have found one after his own heart in Anton Johanson, of the Woodworkers' union. With only his last name dropped for a disguise he strides through the pages of the book as the hero.

Around him are grouped a large number of well-known radicals, some disguised about as effectually as Anton, some directly named and described. As an interesting "human document" the book presents a valuable study. As a sort of deification of anarchy by idealizing its principal Chicago representatives, it is hardly so much of a success. Those who know these men, perhaps a little better and little longer than Mr. Hapgood will find it hard to believe that they have been entertaining such angels unawares.

As a study in working-class psychology, there are portions that are most remarkable. He takes "Anton" and traces his life from boyhood, making him, what he practically is in this respect at least, a typical proletarian. He tramps, is hired and fired with rather more than the average frequency,—due in all probability, in part at least to his possession of something which the author terms a "temper-

ment." He thinks he becomes a Socialist, although here again the knowledge of the facts leads one to doubt the extent of Anton's knowledge on this point. He attends Kropotkin's lecture and becomes converted to anarchy, something which those who heard that lecture can never consider as a very high tribute to his intelligence.

He enters into Chicago Federation of Labor politics, helps, in a mild way to fight "Skinny" Madden, and becomes a trade-union officer.

The "radical" character of Chicago is often commented upon. "Wherever I went in Chicago," he tells us, "and I went everywhere, the ideas I heard expressed were preponderantly 'democratic,' preponderantly on subjects called 'sociological'; expressed with energy and often with distinction. For several months after my arrival in Chicago I saw these 'leading' people mainly: it was before I had become well acquainted with the laboring people themselves. When, however, I met Anton and his friends I felt myself to be in the presence of the source of the ideas in which my cultivated friends were so much interested. It seemed that the ideas and feelings most prevalent in Chicago's intellectual and serious circles began with the laboring class, and were expressed best by the intellectual proletariat. Moreover, I found that in this class, where these feelings and ideas originated, the expression of them was more direct and warmer; if less logical and balanced, it was more real, so real that it was fascinating."

Certainly the author has succeeded in making a most interesting if not fascinating, book out of the matter he discovered. It is one of a class of books that is becoming more and more frequent, that is neither fiction nor fact, neither a treatise nor a novel, but that partakes of both, and perhaps the best of both. It is idealized fact, or at least facts as seen by an idealist,—if there is any difference in the distinction.

The book should do much to remove the prejudice which still exists in "respectable" circles against everything conventional, even if it does not convince anyone of the reasonableness of the unconventional.

Wilshire's Editorials, by Gaylord Wilshire. The Wilshire Book Company, Cloth, 410 pp., m., \$1.00.

It is doubtful if there is any abler journalist in the American Socialist movement than Gaylord Wilshire. He has that peculiar combination of sensationalism, good literary style, striking phraseology and the eye for the interesting that makes up the successful journalist. Like a clever journalist he has selected the most striking features of the Socialist doctrine,—the theory that capitalism must collapse because of a break-down of its industrial machinery in time of a crisis and around this he spins all his material.

"I believe," he says in his preface, "that when the collapse of the present boom shall usher in a huge unemployed problem that the workers of the United States will refuse to be placated by any reasoning of the capitalists to the effect that they ought to expect to go hungry, knowing that they produce so much more than they can buy.

"The day has passed when the people of the United States will be satisfied to starve because they produce too much food.

"The day has passed when the people of a whole village will submit to death from typhoid fever because the doctors and preachers pronounce it a visitation of God as a punishment for the unrighteous-

ness. They now know that typhoid comes with polluted water supply, and they will proceed to purify that supply at once.

"It will be the same way with us Americans in regard to death from starvation when the capitalist cannot employ us owing to over-production. Some years ago we would have starved, thinking that such events as panics and trade depressions were mysterious events sent upon man by a divine providence, into whose way it was profane to explore.

"We now know differently. We know that a trade depression is caused by over-production, which in turn is caused by the inability of the workers to buy with their low wages what they produce. We know that low wages are caused by competition between workers—by the competitive system. We, therefore, see that the base of all the trouble is the competitive system."

This being true the workers will arise and vote to own the trusts and so the conclusion is forced from the preceding cycle of events. This, in short, is the Wilshire method of presenting the Socialist philosophy, and with the exception that it is more symmetrical in its form than the events will justify it is pretty good Marxism.

There is a portion of the philosophy which goes before this, and furnishes the cause of the coming panic, that he so industriously preaches. Comrade Wilshire holds that the work of making the great fundamental tools with which the work of the world is done is practically completed and that these tools tend to constantly create a great army of unemployed. Here is the point where it is impossible to agree with him, at least in any great detail. The work of making the tools of production is never done, but always doing. Nowhere is this more striking than in the illustration which he so frequently uses to point his moral,—the railroads. It is true that the greatest track-age in the United States was laid in the early '80's. But they have been built and rebuilt a dozen times since. Single track has given place to double, forty to ninety pound rails, sand to gravel and stone ballast, while curves have been straightened, grades reduced, tunnels dug, new terminals constructed, etc., altogether often totaling much more in labor or money than the original cost of the road. It is safe to say that more money, several times over is now being expended in constructing railroad terminals into New York City than was ever expended in constructing railroads within fifty miles of that city. The same is even more strikingly true of the factories. That American "scrap-heap" that has been the talk of so many foreign visitors can and will absorb a mighty amount of energy and labor for years to come.

But this point is really not vital to Wilshire's theory. It is a addition of his own, and does not appear in all his writings. This present book is a collection of the best editorials that have appeared in the Challenge and the various forms in which Wilshire's Magazine has appeared during its existence.

Many of them are among the best bits of propaganda in the English language, and some of them have had a wide circulation for this purpose. The many readers of these in the first ephemeral form will welcome this opportunity to secure them in permanent shape.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

What the Publishing House is Doing.

The month of April, 1907, breaks all records. Our book sales for the month are \$2,196.99, sales of stock \$392.99, receipts of the International Socialist Review \$281.27, contribution from Eugene Dietzgen \$250.00; total \$3,021.25.

The increase in the receipts of the Review is mainly due to the fact that we have expended several hundred dollars in advertising a new combination offer, by which we send the Review six months and sixty socialist books, all postpaid for one dollar. The books included in this offer are the forty-five numbers of the Pocket Library of Socialism and fifteen other five cent books, mostly the ones lately purchased by us from the Standard Publishing Company. This offer is still open, and applies to renewals as well as to new subscriptions. For two dollars we will send the Review for a year and two sets of the books. On this offer we receive scarcely the cost of reproducing the books, together with the cost of postage and wrapping, but wish to get a thousand more sets of books into circulation this month and to add a thousand names to the mailing list of the Review.

Where the Money has gone.

We have finished paying for the plates of all books already published, and have discounted all bills for paper used on our books to date, including paper for some books not yet printed. We have also paid the last of the note to John A. Becker, on which six per cent interest was paid, so that hereafter no higher rate of interest than four per cent will be paid for capital used in our work. Every dollar of new capital will now be used promptly in pushing the circulation of our literature harder than ever before, and in bringing out new books which the socialist movement needs. Here is a list of the forthcoming books on which our printers are now at work, with the probable dates of publication. It should be observed that as we do not own a printing and binding plant, but have our work done by

outside contract, we can never be sure in advance of the exact date when any book will be ready. When comrades can afford to pay for books in advance of publication, we welcome the help, since it saves our paying interest, and we trust it will be understood in each case that we will send the books ordered as soon as the manufacture can be completed.

The Theoretical System of Karl Marx. By Louis B. Boudin. Cloth, \$1.00. This book, which will probably be ready for delivery by the time the May Review is in the hands of its readers, will be the best book yet issued for giving a careful student a clear idea of the Marxian theories. In view of the importance of the work, we shall take room here to publish the author's preface in full, since it contains a better explanation of the scope of the book than could be presented in any other way.

PREFACE.

The present volume is substantially a reprint of a series of articles which appeared in the *International Socialist Review* from May, 1905, to October, 1906.

It was my original intention to give in brief compass an account of the causes which called forth the so-called Revisionist movement, the question raised thereby, and its net results, theoretical as well as practical. It soon became apparent to me, however, that such task was impossible of execution even within the space of twice the number (seven) of articles originally contemplated for the series, because of the extreme poverty of the English literature of the subject, and the consequent unpreparedness of our readers for such discussion. In treating of the causes of the Revisionist movement, the Neo-Kantian movement in latter-day philosophy had to be touched upon, but no mere reference or allusion to it would suffice because of the entire unfamiliarity of the English reader with that subject. The revision of Marxism could hardly be discussed with people who had but a bowing acquaintance with the doctrines of that famous system of thought.

I therefore concluded to present to the English reader, instead of an account of the movement to revise Marxism, an **exposition** of the teachings of Marx, and to draw upon the literature of Revisionism only in so far as it may become necessary or expedient in the course of such exposition, in order to accentuate some of its points or differentiate them from others with which they are likely to be confused. I have therefore refrained from entering here into any controversy with any revisionist Marx critic except in so far as was absolutely necessary for my purpose. And I hope at some future time to be able to resume the argument, when I expect to take up the different critics and their criticisms one by one and draw conclusions with them.

I have also refrained from entering into any detailed statement of the Marxian economic theory as I did not intend to make this volume a primer of philosophy and political economy according to Marx, but rather an outline of the Marxian system of thought, with the accent on the **system**, that is the relation of its different parts to

each other and the unity of the whole. It is not meant as a textbook of the Marxian teaching, but as an introduction to the study of Marx, and as an aid to the understanding of him. And in this connection I wish to say that in stating what I considered to be the true Marxian doctrine I never relied on isolated statements or expressions, but always looked to the spirit pervading the whole of his work, for the explanation of any dark point or the solution of any problem encountered.

In the arrangement of the matter I have followed the suggestion of the great Master: I have treated the Materialistic Conception of History as merely introductory to the study of the actual workings of the capitalist system. I appreciate that the problems of the Materialistic Conception of History are many and manifold, but I do not believe that it would have been wise to burden the reader at the very beginning with long and abstruse philosophic discussions. Besides, many of the problems of the Materialistic Conception of History which are considered grave, are so considered only because of the failure of many students of the subject to perceive that these problems are not peculiar to this particular philosophy, but are problems of philosophy in general.

There is one respect, however, in which the Materialistic Conception of History has a harder road to travel than any other system of thought that I know of: the persistent misrepresentations of friend and foe. I have therefore deemed it advisable to attach two appendices, wherein are treated two points with respect to which these perversions and misrepresentations are most frequent and at the same time most glaring.

I hope that the volume herewith presented will give the reader, if not an adequate presentation of the Marxian doctrines, at least an adequate beginning for such presentation, and that it will serve as a stimulant towards an adequate discussion among English-speaking people of the great theoretical problems embraced within the realm of Marxism.

L. B. Boudin.

Landmarks of Scientific Socialism (Anti-Duehring). By Frederick Engels, translated by Austin Lewis. This is one of the greatest socialist classics not yet within the reach of American readers. Our edition will, accidents apart, be ready about the middle of May. It will be the sixteenth volume in the International Library of Social Science, and will sell for one dollar. A full explanation of the scope of the book will be found in the preface of "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific," which is itself an extract from "Anti-Duehring." Comrade Lewis's version does not duplicate the matter in the smaller book, and he has moreover omitted some controversial matter of no great interest today. He has thus presented nearly all that is new and valuable in Engels' great work in the space of a dollar volume. A detailed review of the book will be published later.

Marxian Economics. By Ernest Untermann. Cloth, \$1.00. Comrade Untermann has been unavoidably delayed in completing his work on this volume, which was announced in 1906. It is now however, nearly finished, and we expect to publish it early in June.

It will be far easier and more popular in style than Comrade Boudin's work, and can safely be taken up by less advanced students.

Capital, By Karl Marx. Volume II. The Process of Capitalist Circulation. Translated by Ernest Untermann. Cloth, \$2.00. The type-setting and proof-reading on this book are nearly completed as we go to press with this issue of the Review, and we confidently hope to have copies ready about the first of June. American students of socialism have long been at a disadvantage as compared with their comrades on the continent of Europe, since only the first volume of "Capital" has been within their reach. The growth of our publishing house and the generous help of Eugene Dietzgen have now made possible the publication of the entire work and we hope this year to announce the third volume. Meanwhile every one who wishes to understand socialism should read the first and second volumes.

Socialism, Positive and Negative. By Robert Rives LaMonte. Standard Socialist Series, vol. 19, cloth, 50 cents. We have delayed any full announcement of this book until we could be reasonably sure of the date of publication. The electrotype plates are now completed, and copies of the book should be ready for delivery by May 15. The book will be a surprise and delight to those who do not remember LaMonte's "Science and Socialism," which appeared in the Review for September, 1900. To those who do remember it, the book will be a delight but not a surprise. The book will contain that essay, with half a dozen more, written at intervals since. What he says of "The Nihilism of Socialism" may come as a rude shock to some of our new converts who have not yet gotten rid of their capitalistic ways of thinking, further than to vote for socialism. But if they have patience to read also his essay on "The Biogenetic Law," they will understand the socialist movement, and their own psychology too, far better than before. LaMonte's book will at least make people think, and that is the best thing a book can do, after all. Don't fail to read it.

Capitalist and Laborer. A reply to Goldwin Smith. Also in the same volume, **Modern Socialism**, a reply to W. H. Mallock. By John Spargo. This is as distinctly a propaganda book as LaMonte's is a book for socialists who want to know more of socialism. Spargo's style is simple and persuasive. He answers the objectors courteously and artistically, showing the utter weakness of their arguments, but taking care not to give any needless offense to the prejudices of readers who find it hard to assimilate more than one new idea at a time. If you want a book to give or lend to a student who is not yet a socialist, you will make no mistake in choosing "Capitalist and Laborer." Cloth, 50 cents, ready about May 20.

The Right to be Lazy and Other Studies. By Paul Lafargue, translated by Charles H. Kerr. Cloth, 50 cents. Ready about May 25.

"The Right to be Lazy" is the most widely known of Lafargue's writings. A paper edition of it (10c) is among the books purchased by us from the Standard Publishing Company. That translation, by Dr. Harriet E. Lothrop, is "adapted" with a view to making it more effective propaganda in certain circles. The object of the present translator is to say just what Lafargue said, preserving so far as possible the delicious flavor of his style. In the volume are also included Lafargue's studies entitled "Socialism and the Intellectuals," "The Woman Question," "The Bankruptcy of Capitalism," "The Rights of the Horse and the Rights of Man," and "The Socialist Ideal."

Revolution and Counter-Revolution, or Germany in 1848. By Karl Marx. Cloth, 50 cents. Ready about June 15. We have for several years been importing this standard work of Marx from England, and selling it at \$1.00. The increasing demand for the book and the increase of our working capital makes it possible for us to bring out our own edition at 50 cents. This will be the twenty-second volume of the Standard Socialist Series.

The American Esperanto Book. By Arthur Baker. Cloth, \$1.00. Ready about July 15. Socialists all over the world are coming more and more to realize the advantage of an international language, easily learned, to serve as a medium of communication between comrades of different countries. Comrade Arthur Baker, who conducts the Esperanto column in the Chicago Daily Socialist, has prepared a textbook which will be complete in itself, including lessons, grammar and dictionary so that without any other book it will be possible to master the language. Wait for this instead of buying any other book on the subject. Full particulars later.

SOCIALIST BOOK BULLETIN.

This will be a four-page paper, seven columns to the page, the exact size of the Chicago Daily Socialist, and printed on its press. It will contain a full description of all our books, together with a brief and simple explanation of the principles of socialism. A single copy will be mailed free of charge to any one requesting it. Extra copies will be mailed either to separate addresses or in packages for one cent each, a dollar a hundred. We will send 250 copies in one package by express at purchaser's expense for a dollar, additional copies at the same rate, \$4.00 a thousand. We want to put fifty thousand of these bulletins into circulation before the end of May, and if we can do so, we ought to set a new record for book sales. The Bulletin will be ready about May 20. Send on your orders at once for as many copies as you can circulate. Address

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY (Co-operative)
264 Kinzie Street, Chicago.

Standard Socialist Series

Classics of Socialism in handy volumes, just right either for the pocket or the library shelf. Price 50 cents a volume, including postage to any address.

1. **Karl Marx: Biographical Memoirs.** By Wilhelm Liebknecht, translated by Ernest Untermann.
2. **Collectivism and Industrial Evolution.** By Emile Vandervelde, member of the Chamber of Deputies, Belgium. Translated by Charles H. Kerr.
3. **The American Farmer: An Economic and Historical Study.** By A. M. Simons.
4. **The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association.** By Isaac Broome.
5. **The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.** By Frederick Engels. Translated by Ernest Untermann.
6. **The Social Revolution.** By Karl Kautsky. Translated by A. M. and May Wood Simons.
7. **Socialism, Utopian and Scientific.** By Frederick Engels. Translated by Edward Aveling, D. Sc., with a Special Introduction by the Author.
8. **Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy.** By Frederick Engels. Translated, with Critical Introduction, by Austin Lewis.
9. **American Pauperism and the Abolition of Poverty.** By Isador Ladoff, with a supplement, "Jesus or Mammon," by J. Felix.
10. **Britain for the British (America for the Americans.)** By Robert Blatchford, with American Appendix by A. M. Simons.
11. **Manifesto of the Communist Party.** By Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. Authorized English Translation: Edited and Annotated by Frederick Engels. Also included in the same volume, **No Compromise: No Political Trading.** By Wilhelm Liebknecht. Translated by A. M. Simons and Marcus Hitch.
12. **The Positive School of Criminology.** By Enrico Ferri. Translated by Ernest Untermann.
13. **The World's Revolutions.** By Ernest Untermann.
14. **The Socialists, Who They Are and What They Seek to Accomplish.** By John Spargo.
15. **Social and Philosophical Studies.** By Paul Lafargue. Translated by Charles H. Kerr.
16. **What's So and What Isn't.** By John M. Work.
17. **Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History.** By Karl Kautsky, translated by John B. Askew.
18. **Class Struggles in America.** By A. M. Simons. Third edition, revised, with notes and references.
19. **Socialism, Positive and Negative.** By Robert Rives La Monte.
20. **Capitalist and Laborer.** By John Spargo.

For \$1.15 we will send the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW one year and any one of these books postpaid; for \$1.30 the REVIEW a year and two books; for \$2.00 the REVIEW a year and four books. All are now ready but the last two, which we expect to publish early in May.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY,

(CO-OPERATIVE)

264 East Kinzie Street,

CHICAGO